The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments

UNDER THE EDITORSHIP OF

THE REV. CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D.
Professor of Theological Encyclopedia and Symbolics
Union Theological Seminary, New York

AND

THE REV. SAMUEL ROLLES DRIVER, D.D.
Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford

THE REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.
Late Master of University College, Durham

The International Critical Commentary

On the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments

EDITORS' PREFACE

THERE are now before the public many Commentaries, written by British and American divines, of a popular or homiletical character. *The Cambridge Bible for Schools*, the *Handbooks for Bible Classes and Private Students*, *The Speaker's Commentary*, *The Popular Commentary* (Schaff), *The Expositor's Bible*, and other similar series, have their special place and importance. But they do not enter into the field of Critical Biblical scholarship occupied by such series of Commentaries as the *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum A. T.*; De Wette's *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum N. T.*; Meyer's *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar*; Keil and Delitzsch's *Biblischer Commentar über das A. T.*; Lange's *Theologisch-homiletisches Bibelwerk*; Nowack's *Handkommentar zum A. T.*; Holtzmann's *Handkommentar zum N. T.* Several of these have been translated, edited, and in some cases enlarged and adapted, for the English-speaking public; others are in process of translation. But no corresponding series by British or American divines has hitherto been produced. The way has been prepared by special Commentaries by Cheyne, Ellicott, Kalisch, Lightfoot, Perowne, Westcott, and others; and the time has come, in the judgment of the projectors of this enterprise, when it is practicable to combine British and American scholars in the production of a critical, comprehensive Commentary that will be abreast of modern biblical scholarship, and in a measure lead its van.

Messrs. Charles Scribner's Sons of New York, and Messrs. T. & T. Clark of Edinburgh, propose to publish such a series of Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments, under the editorship of Prof. C. A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., in America, and of Prof. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., for the Old Testament, and the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., for the New Testament, in Great Britain.

The Commentaries will be international and inter-confessional, and will be free from polemical and ecclesiastical bias. They will be based upon a thorough critical study of the original texts of the Bible, and upon critical methods of interpretation. They are designed chiefly for students and clergymen, and will be written in a compact style. Each book will be preceded by an Introduction, stating the results of criticism upon it, and discussing impartially the questions still remaining open. The details of criticism will appear in their proper place in the body of the Commentary. Each section of the Text will be introduced with a paraphrase, or summary of contents. Technical details of textual and philological criticism will, as a rule, be kept distinct from matter of a more general character; and in the Old Testament the exegetical notes will be arranged, as far as possible, so as to be serviceable to students not acquainted with Hebrew. The History of Interpretation of the Books will be dealt with, when necessary, in the Introductions, with critical notices of the most important literature of the subject. Historical and Archæological questions, as well as questions of Biblical Theology, are included in the plan of the Commentaries, but not Practical or Homiletical Exegesis. The Volumes will constitute a uniform series.

The International Critical Commentary

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THE OLD TESTAMENT

GENESIS. The Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England. [*Now Ready.*

EXODUS. The Rev. A. R. S. KENNEDY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, University of Edinburgh.

LEVITICUS. J. F. STENNING, M.A., Fellow of Wadham College, Oxford.

NUMBERS. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

DEUTERONOMY. The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

JOSHUA. The Rev. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Principal of the University of Aberdeen.

JUDGES. The Rev. GEORGE MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

SAMUEL. The Rev. H. P. SMITH, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and History of Religion, Meadville, Pa. [*Now Ready.*

KINGS. The Rev. FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., D.Litt., LL.D., President and Professor of Hebrew and Cognate Languages, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

CHRONICLES. The Rev. EDWARD L. CURTIS, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

EZRA AND NEHEMIAH. The Rev. L. W. BATTEN, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, General Theological Seminary, New York City.

PSALMS. The Rev. CHAS. A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*2 vols. Now Ready*

PROVERBS. The Rev. C. H. TOY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

JOB. The Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, Oxford.

ISAIAH. Chaps. I–XXVII. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ISAIAH. Chaps. XXVIII–XXXIX. The Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D. Chaps. LX–LXVI. The Rev. A. S. PEAKE, M.A., D.D., Dean of the Theological Faculty of the Victoria University and Professor of Biblical Exegesis in the University of Manchester, England.

JEREMIAH. The Rev. A. F. KIRKPATRICK, D.D., Dean of Ely, sometime Regius Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge, England.

EZEKIEL. The Rev. G. A. COOKE, M.A., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture, University of Oxford, and the Rev. CHARLES F. BURNEY, D.Litt., Fellow and Lecturer in Hebrew, St. John's College, Oxford.

DANIEL. The Rev. JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., D.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, now Rector of St. Michael's Church, New York City.

AMOS AND HOSEA. W. R. HARPER, Ph.D., LL.D., sometime President of the University of Chicago, Illinois. [*Now Ready.*

MICAH, ZEPHANIAH, NAHUM, HABAKKUK, OBADIAH, AND JOEL. Prof. JOHN P. SMITH, University of Chicago; W. HAYES WARD, D.D., LL.D., Editor of *The Independent*, New York; Prof. JULIUS A. BEWER, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

ZECHARIAH TO JONAH. Prof. H. G. MITCHELL, D.D., Prof. JOHN P. SMITH and Prof. J. A. BEWER. [*Now Ready.*

ESTHER. The Rev. L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary. [*Now Ready.*

ECCLESIASTES. Prof. GEORGE A. BARTON, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Bryn Mawr College, Pa. [*Now Ready.*

RUTH, SONG OF SONGS AND LAMENTATIONS. Rev. CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THE NEW TESTAMENT

ST. MATTHEW. The Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Theology and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

ST. MARK. Rev. E. P. GOULD, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Literature, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia. [*Now Ready.*

ST. LUKE. The Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., sometime Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

ST. JOHN. The Right Rev. JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., Bishop of Ossory, Ireland.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Oxford, and the Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer in Divinity and Hebrew, Exeter College, Oxford.

ACTS. The Rev. C. H. TURNER, D.D., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and the Rev. H. N. BATE, M.A., Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

ROMANS. The Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Principal of King's College, London. [*Now Ready.*

I. CORINTHIANS. The Right Rev. ARCH ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Exeter, and Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., late Master of University College, Durham. [*Now Ready.*

II. CORINTHIANS. The Rev. DAWSON WALKER, D.D., Theological Tutor in the University of Durham.

GALATIANS. The Rev. ERNEST D. BURTON, D.D., Professor of New Testament Literature, University of Chicago.

EPHESIANS AND COLOSSIANS. The Rev. T. K. ABBOTT, B.D., D.Litt., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek, Trinity College, Dublin, now Librarian of the same. [*Now Ready.*

PHILIPPIANS AND PHILEMON. The Rev. MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. [*Now Ready.*

THESSALONIANS. The Rev. JAMES E. FRAME, M.A., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City. [*In Press.*

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. The Rev. WALTER LOCK, D.D., Warden of Keble College and Professor of Exegesis, Oxford.

HEBREWS. The Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland.

ST. JAMES. The Rev. JAMES H. ROPES, D.D., Bussey Professor of New Testament Criticism in Harvard University.

PETER AND JUDE. The Rev. CHARLES BIGG, D.D., sometime Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Now Ready.*

THE EPISTLES OF ST. JOHN. The Rev. E. A. BROOKE, B.D., Fellow and Divinity Lecturer in King's College, Cambridge. [*In Press.*

REVELATION. The Rev. ROBERT H. CHARLES, M.A., D.D., sometime Professor of Biblical Greek in the University of Dublin.

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH, MALACHI AND JONAH

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

HAGGAI, ZECHARIAH MALACHI AND JONAH

BY

HINCKLEY G. MITCHELL, D.D.
JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH, Ph.D.
JULIUS A. BEWER, Ph.D.

NEW YORK
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS
1912

Published June, 1912

PREFACE

THIS volume completes the series of commentaries on the Minor Prophets originally undertaken by the late William R. Harper. The order of arrangement differs from the traditional one only in the case of Jonah, which is placed at the end of the series, not only because it was composed at a much later date than the traditional order suggests, but also because it is of a different character from the other prophets.

This volume, like the previous one, is composed of three little volumes bound in one, because it seemed best on the whole to publish the work of the three authors under separate sub-titles in this way.

CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS.

I. TEXTS AND VERSIONS.

$\mathfrak{A}$ = Arabic Version.
Ant. = Antwerp Polyglot.
Aq. = Version of Aquila.
Arm. = Armenian Version.
ARV. = American Revised Version.
AV. = Authorized Version.

Baer = Baer and Delitzsch's Hebrew text.
Bres. = Brescia ed. of the Hebrew Bible (1492–94).

$\mathfrak{C}^{Bo.}$ = Bohairic ed. of the Coptic Version.
Comp. = Complutensian Polyglot.
de R. = de Rossi, *Variae Lectiones Veteris Testamenti, etc.*, Vol. III. (1786), and *Scholia Critica in Veteris Testamenti libros* (1798).

Eth. = Ethiopic Version.
EV. = English Version.

$\mathfrak{G}$ = Received Greek Version.
$\mathfrak{G}^{\aleph}$ = Sinaitic codex.
$\mathfrak{G}^{A}$ = Alexandrian codex.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Ald.}$ = Aldine edition.
$\mathfrak{G}^{B}$ = Vatican codex.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Comp.}$ = Complutensian edition.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Curss.}$ = Cursive mss.
$\mathfrak{G}^{\Gamma}$ = Codex Cryptoferratensis.
$\mathfrak{G}^{H}$ = Hexapla mss.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Held.}$ = Heidelberg Papyrus Codex, containing the text of Zc. 4[4]–Mal. 4[5]; edited and published, with facsimiles, by A. Deissmann, in *Septuaginta-Papyri und andere altChristliche Texte der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung* (Heidelberg, 1905).
$\mathfrak{G}^{Jer.}$ = Jerome's translation from the Greek.
$\mathfrak{G}^{L}$ = Lucianic mss.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Q}$ = Codex Marchalianus.
$\mathfrak{G}^{Y}$ = Codex Taurinensis.
Gins. = Ginsburg, D.; *Biblia Hebraica*, 1894.

$\mathfrak{H}$ = Hebrew consonant text; Hebrew of Polyglots.
HP. = Texts of Holmes and Parsons.

J = Yahwistic (Judaic) portions of the Hexateuch.

Kenn. = Kennicott, Benj.; *Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum, cum variis lectionibus* (1776–80).
Kit. = Kittel, R.; *Biblia Hebraica* (1905–6).

Kt. = *K'thib*, the Hebrew text as written.

$\mathfrak{L}$ = Old Latin Version.
Lond. = London Polyglot (1653–57).
Lu. = Luther's Version.

$\mathfrak{M}$ = Massoretic pointed text.
Mas. = Massorah.

NT. = New Testament.

OT. = Old Testament.

Par. = Paris Polyglot (1629–45).
Pes. = Pesaro eds. of the Hebrew Bible.

Qr. = *Q're*, the Hebrew text as read.

RV. = Revised Version.
RVm. = Revised Version, margin.

$\mathfrak{S}$ = Syriac Peshitto Version.
$\mathfrak{S}^{A}$ = Ambrosian codex.
$\mathfrak{S}^{H}$ = Syro-hexaplar readings.
$\mathfrak{S}^{L}$ = Lee's edition.
$\mathfrak{S}^{U}$ = Urumian codex.
Sonc. = Soncino eds. of the Hebrew Bible.
Σ = Version of Symmachus.

$\mathfrak{T}$ = Targum.
Θ = Version of Theodotion.

$\mathfrak{V}$ = Vulgate Version.
Ven. = Venice eds. of the Hebrew Bible.
Vrss. = Versions, ancient.

II. BOOKS OF THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENTS.

Am. = Amos.

BS. = The Wisdom of Jesus Ben Sira, or Ecclesiasticus.

1, 2 Ch. = 1, 2 Chronicles.
Ch. = *Idem*, taken together.
Col. = Colossians.
1, 2 Cor. = 1, 2 Corinthians.
Ct. = Canticles = The Song of Songs.

Dn. = Daniel.
Dt. = Deuteronomy.

Ec. = Ecclesiastes.
Ecclus. = Ecclesiasticus.
Eph. = Ephesians.
1, 2 Esd. = 1, 2 Esdras.
Est. = Esther.
Ex. = Exodus.
Ez. = Ezekiel.

Ezr. = Ezra.

Gal. = Galatians.
Gn. = Genesis.

Hb. = Habakkuk.
Heb. = Hebrews.
Hg. = Haggai.
Ho. = Hosea.

Is. = Isaiah.

Jb. = Job.
Je. = Jeremiah.
Jn. = John.
Jo. = Joel.
Jon. = Jonah.
Jos. = Joshua.
Ju. = Judges.
Jud. = Judith.

1, 2 K. = 1, 2 Kings.
K. = *Idem*, taken together.

La. = Lamentations.
Lk. = Luke.
Lv. = Leviticus.

1, 2 Mac. = 1, 2 Maccabees.
Mal. = Malachi.
Mi. = Micah.
Mk. = Mark.
Mt. = Matthew.

Na. = Nahum.
Ne. = Nehemiah.
Nu. = Numbers.

Ob. = Obadiah.

Pe. = Peter.
Phil. = Philippians.
Pr. = Proverbs.
Ps. = Psalms.

Rev. = Revelation.
Rom. = Romans.
Ru. = Ruth.

1, 2 S. = 1, 2 Samuel.
S. = *Idem*, taken together.
S.–K. = The books of Samuel and Kings taken together.

1, 2 Thes. = 1, 2 Thessalonians.
1, 2 Tim. = 1, 2 Timothy.
Tob. = Tobit.

Wisd. = Wisdom of Solomon.

Zc. = Zechariah.
Zp. = Zephaniah.

III. AUTHORS AND WRITINGS.

Abar. = Abarbanel (†1508).
AE. = Aben Ezra (†1167); *Commentary*.
AJTh. = *American Journal of Theology*.
á Lap. = á Lapide, Cornelius; *Commentarius in duodecim Prophetas Minores* (1628).
And. = André, Tony; *Le Prophète Aggée* (1895).
Arrianus = Arrianus, Fl.; *The Anabasis of Alexander*, ed. Chinnock (1884).
ARW. = *Archiv für Religions wissenschaft*.
Asada = Asada, Eiji; *The Hebrew Text of Zechariah* (1899).
Baer = Baer, S.; *Liber duodecim Prophetarum* (1878).
Baud. = Baudissin, W. W.; *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte* (1876–78).
Baumgarten = Baumgarten, M.; *Die Nachtgesichte Sacharias* (1854–55).
BDB. = Brown, Driver and Briggs; *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (1906).
Bechhaus = Bechhaus, J. H.; *Ueber die Integrität der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Bundes* (1796).

Ben. = W. H. Bennett; *The Religion of the Post-Exilic Prophets* (1907).

Benz. = Benzinger, I.; *Hebräische Archäologie* (1894; 2d ed., 1907).

Bertholdt = Bertholdt, L.; *Einleitung in . . . das Alte und Neue Testament* (1814).

Bla. = Blayney, Benj.; *A new translation of the Prophecies of Zechariah* (1797).

Bleek = Bleek, Fried.; *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. Wellhausen, ed. 5 (1886). *Das Zeitalter von Sacharja Cap.* 9–14; SK. (1852, 1857).

Bö. = Böttcher, Fried.; *Neue Aehrenlese zum Alten Testament* (1863–65).

Bö.§ = *Idem, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (1867–68).

Böh. = Böhme, W.; *Zu Maleachi und Haggai, ZAW.* (1887).

Böhmer = Böhmer, Jul.; *Haggai und Sacharja; Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift* (1901).

Brd. = Bredenkamp, C. J.; *Der Prophet Sacharja* (1879).

Brugsch = Brugsch, Hein.; *A History of Egypt under the Pharaohs* (1881).

Bruston = Bruston, Ch.; *Histoire Critique de la Littérature des Hebreux* (1881).

Bu. = Budde, Karl; *Zum Text der drei letzten kleinen Propheten, ZAW.*, XXVI (1906).

Bu.[BU] = *Idem, Die biblische Urgeschichte* (1883).

Bu.[Gesch.] = *Idem, Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur* (1906).

Buhl = Buhl, Frants; *Kanon und Text des Alten Testaments* (1891).

Burger = Burger, J. D. F.; *Le Prophète Zacharie* (1841).

Cal. = Calvin, John; *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, ed. Owen (1846).

C. and HB. = Carpenter and Harford - Battersby; *The*

C. and HB.—*Continued.* *Hexateuch* (1900).

Carpzov = Carpzov, J. C.; *Critica Sacra Veteris Testamenti* (1728).

Che. = Cheyne, T. K.; *Critica Biblica*, ii (1903).

Chrys. = Chrysostom.

Cocceius = Cocceius, J.; Τὸ Δωδεκαπρόφητον (1652).

Conder = Conder, C. R.; *Tent Life in Palestine* (1878).

Cor. = Cornill, C. H.; *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, ed. 6 (1908).

Corrodi = Corrodi, H.; *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüd. u. christl. Kanons* (1792).

Cyr. = Cyril of Alexandria (†444); ed. Migne, iv.

Da. = Davidson, A. B.; *The Theology of the Old Testament* (1904).

Da.§ = *Idem*, *Heb. Grammar.*

Dathe = Dathe, J. A.; *Prophetæ Minores* (1773).

Davidson = Davidson, Sam'l; *An Introduction to the Old Testament* (1862–3).

DB. = *A Dictionary of the Bible* (1898–1904).

de D. = de Dieu, Lud.; *Critica Sacra* (1693).

de W. = de Wette, W. M. L.; *Einleitung in das AT.*, ed. Schrader (1869).

DHM. = D. H. Müller; *Discours de Malachie sur le rite des sacrifices*, *Revue biblique internationale*, V (1896), 535–539 (= *Strophenbau und Responsion* [1898], pp. 40–45).

Di. = Dillmann, A.; *Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie* (1895).

Diodorus = Diodorus Siculus; *History.*

Dl. = Delitzsch, Fried.; *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch* (1896).

Dl.[Par.] = *Idem*, *Wo lag das Paradies?* (1881).

Dr. = S. R. Driver, *The Minor Prophets* (*The Century Bible*; 1906).

Dr.[Int.] = *Idem*, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, Revised ed. (1910).

Dr.^{t} = *Idem, The Use of the Tenses in Hebrew*, ed. 6 (1898).

Drake = Drake, W.; Haggai and Zechariah (*The Speaker's Commentary*) (1876).

Dru. = Drusius, Joh.; *Commentarius in Prophetas Minores XII*. (1627).

Du. = Duhm, Bernh.; *Das Buch Jeremia* (*Kurzer Hand-Commentar*) (1901).

Du.$^{Pro.}$ = *Idem, Die zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt* (1910); or *Anmerkungen zu den zwölf Propheten, ZAW.*, XXXI (1911).

Du.$^{Theol.}$ = *Idem, Die Theologie der Propheten* (1875).

Duncker = Duncker, Max; *History of Antiquity*, from the German (1877–82).

EB. = *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1899–1903).

Eckardt = Eckardt, R.; *Der Sprachgebrauch von Zach.*, 9–14; *ZAW.* XIII (1893).

Eichhorn = Eichhorn, J. G.; *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, ed. 4 (1824).

Ephraem = Ephraem Syrus (†373); *Explanatio in Zachariam*.

Ew. = Ewald, Hein.; *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes* (1867–68).

Ew.§ = *Idem, Ausführliches Lehrbuch der heb. Sprache* (1870).

Flügge = Flügge, B. G.; *Die Weissagungen welche bey den Schriften des Propheten Zacharias beygebogen sind* (1784).

Forberg = Forberg, Ed.; *Commentarius in Zachariæ vaticiniorum partem posteriorem* (1824).

Fürst = Fürst, Jul.; *Der Kanon des Alten Testaments* (1868).

GASm. = Smith, G. A.; *The Book of the Twelve Prophets*, I (1896); II (1898).

GASm.^{HG} = *Idem, The Historical Geography of the Holy Land* (1894).

Geiger = Geiger, A.; *Urschrift und Ue-*

Geiger—*Continued.* *bersetzungen der Bibel* (1857).

Ges. = Gesenius, W.; *Commentar über den Jesaia* (1821).

Ges.^{K} = *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*, ed. Kautzsch, (1909^{28}); trans. Collins & Cowley (1910^{2}).

Gie. = Giesebrecht, Fried.; *Das Buch Jeremia* (*Handkommentar*) (1894).

Gins.$^{Int.}$ = Ginsburg, D.; *Introduction to . . . Hebrew Bible* (1897).

Grätz = Grätz, H.; *Emendationes, Fasc.* 2 (1893).

Gray = Gray, G. B.; *Hebrew Proper Names* (1896).

Grot. = Grotius, Hugo; *Annotata ad Vetus Testamentum* (1644).

Grützmacher = Grützmacher, G.; *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der in Zach.* 9–14 *vorliegenden Prophetien* (1892).

Gunkel = Gunkel, H.; *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895).

Gu. = Guthe, H.; *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (*SBOT.*) (1901).

H.^{AH} = Harper, W. R.; *Amos and Hosea* (*ICC.*) (1905).

Hal. = J. Halévy; *Le prophète Malachie, Revue sémitique*, XVII (1909), 1–44.

Hammond = Hammond, H.; *Paraphrase and Annotations upon all the Books of the New Testament* (1653).

Hanauer = Hanauer, J. E.; *Tales Told in Palestine* (1904).

Hd. = Henderson, E. *The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets* (1868).

Hengstenberg = Hengstenberg, E. W.; *Die Authentie des Daniel und die integritāt des Sacharja* (1831).

Herodotus = Herodotus; *History*, ed. Rawlinson (3) (1875).

Hi. = Hitzig, Ferd.; *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten*, ed. Steiner (1881).

Houb. = Houbigant, C. F.; *Notae criticae in universos Veteris Testamenti libros* (1777).

HPA. = Wickes; *Hebrew Poetical Accents.*

HPS. = Smith, H. P.; *Old Testament History* (1903).

ICC. = *International Critical Commentary.*

Isop. = O. Isopescul, *Der Prophet Malachias* (1908).

Jastrow = Jastrow, M.; *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (1898).

JBL. = *Journal of Biblical Literature.*

Jer. = Jerome (†420); *Commentarii.*

Jos.$^{\text{Ant.}}$ = Josephus, Fl.; *Antiquities of the Jews.*

Jos.$^{\text{Ap.}}$ = *Idem, Contra Apion.*

JTS. = *Journal of Theological Studies.*

JQR. = *Jewish Quarterly Review.*

KAT. = Schrader, E.; *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, ed. 2 (1883); ed. 3 (Zimmern and Winckler) (1902).

Kau. = Kautzsch, E.; *Die heilige Schrift des alten Testaments*, ed. 3 (1910).

KB. = *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek* (1889–1900).

Ke. = Keil, C. F.; *Biblischer Commentar über die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1873).

Kent = C. F. Kent; *Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets* (1910).

Ki. = Kimchi, David (†1230); Commentary.

Kidder = Kidder, Rich.; *Demonstration of the Messiah* (1700).

Kl. = P. Kleinert; *Die Profeten Israels in sozialer Beziehung* (1905).

Klie. = Kliefoth, Th.; *Der Prophet Sacharjah* (1862).

Klo. = Klostermann, Aug.; *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1896).

Knobel = Knobel, A.; *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer* (1837).

Kö.$^{\text{Einl.}}$ = König, F. E.; *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (1893).

Kö.§ = *Idem, Syntax der hebräischen Sprache* (1897).

Köh. = Köhler, Aug.; *Die nachexilischen Propheten* (1860–65).

Kosters = Kosters, W. H.; *Die Wiederherstellung Israels*, from the Dutch (1895).

Köster = Köster, F. B.; *Meletemata . . . in Zachariæ Prophetæ partem posteriorem Cap. ix–xiv* (1818).

Kraetzschmar = Kraetzschmar, R.; *Das Buch Ezechiel* (*Handkommentar*) (1900).

Kue. = Kuenen, A.; *Historisch-kritisch Onderzoek naar het Ontstaan en de Verzamling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds*, ed. 2 (1889–93).

Kui. = Kuiper, A. K.; *Zacharia, ix–xiv* (1894).

Lambert = Lambert, M.; *Notes Exégétiques; REJ.*, tome 43, pp. 268 *f.*

Lange = Lange, J. P.; *Die Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi* (1876).

Ley = Ley, J.; *Zu Sacharja* 6:9–15.

Lowe = Lowe, W. H.; *The Hebrew Student's Commentary on Zechariah* (1882).

Lowth = Lowth, Wm.; *Commentary upon the Prophecy of Daniel and the XII. Minor Prophets* (continuation of Patrick's Commentary, ed. 6) (1766).

Mahaffy = Mahaffy, J. P.; *Egypt under the Ptolemies* (1899).
A History of Egypt iv (1899). See Petrie.

Marck = Marck, Joh.; *Commentarius in duodecim Prophetas Minores* (1784).

Marti = Marti, Karl; *Dodekapropheton* (1904).
Der Prophet Sacharja der Zeitgenosse Zerubbabels (1892).
Zwei Studien zu Sacharja; SK. (1892).

Marti^Kau. = *Idem, Der Prophet Maleachi*, in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift* (1910), pp. 97–104.

Matthes = Matthes, J. C.; *Hag.* 1:9; 2:15–19; *ZAW.* (1903).

Mau.	= Maurer, F. J. V. D.; *Commentarius . . . in Vetus Testamentum*, ii (1840).
Mede	= Mede, Joseph; *Dissertationum ecclesiasticarum triga. Quibus accedunt fragmenta sacra* (1653).
Meyer	= Meyer, Ed.; *Die Entstehung des Judenthums* (1896). *Geschichte des Alterthums*, iii (1901).
Mich.	= Michaelis, J. D., on Flügge's *Weissagungen*, etc.; *Neue orientalische und exegetische Bibliothek* (1786).
Mitchell	= Mitchell, H. G.; *Some Final Constructions in Biblical Hebrew* (1879).
Montet	= Montet, E.; *Étude critique sur la date assignable aux six dernier chapîtres de Zacharie* (1882).
Moore	= Moore, T. V.; *Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi* (1856).
Neumann	= Neumann, W.; *Die Weissagungen des Sacharja* (1860).
New.	= Newcome, Wm.; *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, ed. 2 (1809).
Nickel	= Nickel, Joh.; *Die Wiederherstellung des jüd. Gemeindewesens nach dem Exil* (1899).
Nö.	= Nöldeke, Th.; *Aufsätze zur persischen Geschichte* (1887).
Norzi	= Norzi, J. S.; *Sepher 'arba'ah we-'esrim* (Hebrew Bible) (1742).
Now.	= Nowack, W.; *Die kleinen Propheten* (*Handkommentar*), 2d ed. (1903).
Now.Arch.	= *Idem, Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie* (1894).
Now.K	= *Idem, Duodecim Prophetae*, in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (1906).
Nrd.	= Nordheimer, I.; *A Critical Grammar of the Hebrew Language* (1840).
Oesterley	= Oesterley, W. O. E.; *Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets*; *JTS.*, V.
Ols.	= Olshausen, J.; *Lehrbuch der he-*

Ols —*Continued.* *bräischen Sprache* (1861).

Oort = Oort, H.; *Textus Hebraici Emendationes* (1900).

Or. = von Orelli, C.; *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (*Kurzgefasster Kommentar*), 3d ed. (1908); (Eng., 1893).

P = Priestly writer of Hexateuch.

PEF. = *Palestine Exploration Fund.*

Peiser = Peiser, F. E.; *Zu Zacharia; Orientalistische Literaturzeitung* (1901).

Pem. = Pemble, Wm.; *A Short and Sweet Exposition upon the First 9 Chapters of Zacharie* (1658).

Per. = Perowne, J. J. S.; *Haggai and Zechariah* (1893).

Peters = Peters, J. P.; *Nippur* (1897).

Petrie = Petrie, W. M. F.; *A History of Egypt*, iii (1905).

Piepenbring = Piepenbring, Ch.; *Theology of the Old Testament*, from the French (1893).

Pinches = Pinches, T. G.; *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records of Assyria and Babylonia* (1902).

Polybius = Polybius; *Histories*, ed. Shuckburgh (1889).

Prášek = Prášek, J. V.; *Geschichte der Meder und Perser* (1906).

PRE.[3] = *Protestantische Real-Encyklopädie*, 3d ed.

Pres. = Pressel, W.; *Commentar zu den Schriften der Propheten Haggai, Sacharja, und Maleachi* (1870).

Prince = Prince, J. D.; *A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (1899).

Pu. = Pusey, E. B.; *The Minor Prophets* (1885).

Ra. = Rashi (Rab. Shelomoh ben Yishak, 1040–1105); Commentary.

RB. = *Revue Biblique.*

Reinke = Reinke, L.; *Der Prophet Maleachi* (1856).
Idem, *Der Prophet Haggai* (1868).

REJ. = *Revue des Études Juives.*

Reu. = Reuss, Ed.; *Das Alte Testament* (1892–94).

Rib. = de Ribera, F.; *Commentarius in libros XII. Prophetarum* (1581).

Ries. = Riessler, P., *Die kleinen Propheten* (1911).

Robinson = Robinson, G. L.; *The Prophecies of Zechariah* (1896).

Rodkinson = Rodkinson, M. L.; *The Babylonian Talmud* in English (1896–1903).

Rogers = Rogers, R. W.; *A History of Babylonia and Assyria* (1900).

Rosenm. = Rosenmüller, E. F. C.; *Scholia in Prophetas Minores* (1836).

Rothstein = Rothstein, J. W.; *Die Genealogie des Königs Jojachin und seiner Nachkommen* (1902).

RP. = *Records of the Past*, ed. 2 (1889).

Rub. = Rubinkam, N. I.; *The Second Part of the Book of Zechariah* (1892).

Sanctius = Sanctius (Sanchez), C.; *Commentarius in Prophetas Minores* (1621).

Sandrock = Sandrock, H. L.; *Prioris et posterioris Zachariæ partis vaticinia ab uno eodemque auctore propheta* (1856).

SBOT. = *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, Paul Haupt, Editor.

Schegg = P. Schegg; *Die Kleinen Propheten*, II (1854).

Seb. = Sebök, Mark; *Die syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1887).

Seck. = Secker, Thos.; Manuscript notes cited by Newcome.

Sellin = Sellin, Ernest; *Serubbabel* (1898). *Studien zur Entstehungsgeschichte der jüd. Gemeinde nach dem bab. Exil* (1901).

Siev. = Sievers, Ed.; *Metrische Studien*, I (1901). *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, 4, *Zu Maleachi* (1905 *f*.).

SK. = *Studien und Kritiken*.

Sm. = Smend, R.; *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, 2d ed. (1899).

Spoer = Spoer, Hans; *Some new considerations towards the dating of the*

Spoer—*Continued.* *Bk. of Malachi, JQR.*, XX (1908).

SS. = C. Siegfried and B. Stade, *Hebräisches Wörterbuch Zum Alten Testamente* (1893).

Sta. = Stade, Bernh.; *Deuterozacharja; ZAW.* (1881, 1882).

Sta.§ = *Idem, Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik* (1879).

Sta.GVI = *Idem, Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (1887–88).

Sta.Theol. = *Idem, Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments* (1905).

Staerk = Staerk, W.; *Untersuchungen über die Composition und Abfassungszeit von Zach.* 9–14 (1891).

Stäh. = Stähelin, J. J.; *Einleitung in die kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (1862).

Stei. = Steiner, H.; additions to Hitzig's *Kleine Propheten.*

Stek. = J. Z. Schuurmans Stekhoven; *De Alexandrijnsche Vertaling van het Dodekapropheton* (1887).

Ston. = Stonard, John; *A Commentary on the Vision of Zechariah* (1824).

Talm. = Talmud: Tal.B., the Babylonian; Tal.J., the Jerusalem Talmud.

ThSt. = *Theol. Stud.*

Theiner = Theiner, J. A.; *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten* (1828).

Theod. Mops. = Theodore of Mopsuestia (†429); *Quae Supersunt Omnia*, ed. Wegnern (1834).

Theodoret = Theodoret (†457); *Commentarius in duodecim Prophetas*, ed. 1642.

Torrey = C. C. Torrey; *The Prophecy of Malachi, JBL.*, XVII (1898), 1–15; and art. *Malachi* in *EB.*, III (1902).

Toy = Toy, C. H.; *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (*SBOT.*) (1899). *Evil Spirits in the Bible, JBL.*, IX (1890).

Tristram = Tristram, H. B.; *Natural History*

Tristram—*Continued.* *of the Bible* (1873).

van H. = van Hoonacker, A.; *Les douze petits prophètes* (1908).
Les chapitres ix–xiv du livre Zecharie, RB. (1902).

Vatke = Vatke, W.; *Biblische Theologie* (1834).

v. Ort. = von Ortenberg, E. F. J.; *Die Bestandtheile des Buches Sacharja* (1859).

We. = Wellhausen, J.; *Die kleinen Propheten*, ed. 3 (1898).

We.[IJG] = *Idem, Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (1907).

Weber = Weber, Ferd.; *Altsynagogalische palästinische Theologie* (1880).

Whiston = Whiston, Wm.; *Essay toward restoring the true text of the Old Testament* (1722).

Wickes = Wickes, Wm.; *The Hebrew Prose Accents* (1888).

Wiedemann = Wiedemann, A.; *Geschichte Aegyptens von Psammetik I. bis auf Alexander den Grossen* (1880).

Wild. = Wildeboer, G.; *De Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds* (1886; 3d ed., 1903).

Wilson = Wilson, C. T.; *Peasant Life in the Holy Land* (1906).

Wkl. = Winckler, Hugo; *Maleachi, Altorientalische Forschungen*, II (1899), 531–539.

Wri. = Wright, C. H. H.; *Zechariah and his Prophecies* (1879).

WRS.[OTJC] = W. Robertson Smith; *Old Testament in the Jewish Church.*

WRS.[PI] = *Idem, The Prophets of Israel.*

ZAW.; *ZATW.* = *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

ZDPV. = *Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins.*

IV. GENERAL, ESPECIALLY GRAMMATICAL.

abs. = absolute.
abstr. = abstract.
acc. = accusative.
acc. cog. = cognate acc.
acc. pers. = acc. of person.
acc. rei. = acc. of thing.
acc. to = according to.
act. = active.
adj. = adjective.
adv. = adverb.
ἅπ. or ἅ. λ. = ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, word or phr. used once.
alt. = alternative.
alw. = always.
apod. = apodosis.
Ar. = Arabic.
Aram. = Aramaic, Aramean.
art. = article.
Assy. = Assyria, Assyrian.

Bab. = Babylonian.
b. Aram. = biblical Aramaic.
bibl. = biblical.

caus. = causative.
ch., chs. = chapter, chapters.
c. = *circa*, about.
cod., codd. = codex, codices.
cog. = cognate.
col., coll. = column, columns.
com. = commentary, commentators.
cp. = compare.
concr. = concrete.
cf. = *confer*, compare.
conj. = conjunction.
consec. = consecutive.
cstr. = construct.
constr. = construction.
contra = contrariwise.
crit. n. = critical note.

d. f. = daghesh forte.

def. = defective.
del. = *dele*, strike out.
dittog. = dittography.
dub. = dubious, doubtful.

E. = east, eastern.
ed., edd. = edition, editions.
e. g. = for example.
elsw. = elsewhere.
esp. = especially.
et al. = *et aliter*, and elsewhere, and others.
Eth. = Ethiopic.
exc. = except.

f., *ff.* = and following.
fem. = feminine.
fig. = figurative.
fin = toward the end.
f. n. = foot-note.
freq. = frequentative.
fut. = future.

gen. = genitive.
gent. = gentilic.
Gk. = Greek.

haplog. = haplography.
Heb. = Hebrew.
Hiph. = Hiphil of verb.
Hithp. = Hithpael of verb.

id. = *idem*, the same.
i. e. = *id est*, that is.
impf. = imperfect.
imv. = imperative.
indef. = indefinite.
inf. = infinitive.
ins. = inscription, inscriptions.
intrans. = intransitive.
Intro. = Introduction

juss. = jussive.

l., ll. = line, lines.

l. c.	= *loco citato*, in the place before cited.
lit.	= literal, literally.
marg.	= margin, marginal.
masc.	= masculine.
metr.	= metrical.
mod.	= modern.
mss.	= manuscripts.
mt.	= mount(ain).
mtr. cs.	= *metri causā* = for the sake of the metre.
N.	= north, northern.
NE.	= north-east.
NW.	= north-west.
n.	= note.
NH.	= New Hebrew.
Niph.	= Niphal of verb.
obj.	= object.
oft.	= often.
om., oms.	= omit, omits.
p., pp.	= page, pages.
parall.	= parallelism.
part.	= particle.
pass.	= passive.
pers.	= person.
pf.	= perfect.
Pi.	= Piel of verb.
pl.	= plural.
plupf.	= pluperfect.
Po.	= Polel.
pred.	= predicate.
preg.	= pregnant.
prep.	= preposition.
prob.	= probable.
pron.	= pronoun.
proph.	= prophet, prophetic.
prtc.	= participle.
Pu.	= Pual of verb.
Qal	= Qal of verb.
q. v.	= *quod vide*, which see.
rd., rds.	= read, reads.
refl.	= reflexive.
rel.	= relative.
rm.	= remark.
S.	= south, southern.
SE.	= south-east.
SW.	= south-west.
Sab.	= Sabean.
sf., sfs.	= suffix, suffixes.
sg.	= singular.
sq.	= followed by.
str.	= strophe.
subj.	= subject.
subst.	= substantive.
Syr.	= Syriac.
s. v.	= *sub voce.*
t.	= times (following a number).
text. n.	= textual note.
tr.	= transpose.
trans.	= transitive.
v., vv.	= verse, verses.
v.	= *vide*, see.
vb.	= verb.
v. i.	= *vide infra*, see below (usually textual note on same verse).
viz.	= *videlicet*, namely, to wit.
voc.	= vocative.
v. s.	= *vide supra*, see above (usually general remark on same verse).
W.	= west, western.

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY

ON

HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH

BY

HINCKLEY G. MITCHELL,
PROFESSOR OF HEBREW AND OLD TESTAMENT EXEGESIS
IN TUFTS COLLEGE

INTRODUCTION.

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE PROPHECIES OF HAGGAI AND ZECHARIAH.

§ 1. CYRUS.

The career of Cyrus was watched with the intensest interest from the beginning by all the peoples of western Asia. The boldness and success of his invasion of Media in 550 B.C., and the vigour with which he enforced his sovereignty over this great kingdom, drove Crœsus of Lydia and Nabonidus of Babylonia to an alliance with each other and with Ahmes of Egypt for their common protection. The degree of interest among the Babylonians appears from a chronicle of the period in which there is an account, not only of the Median campaign, but of one, three years later, in another direction, as well as of that which in 539 B.C. resulted in the occupation of Babylon and the submission of the empire of which it was the capital.* When the conqueror finally invaded Babylonia the inhabitants took different attitudes toward him. The king and his party, including the crown prince, Belshazzar, of course, did what they could to withstand him. The priests, on the other hand, whom Nabonidus had offended by neglecting the worship of Marduk and bringing the gods of other cities in numbers to the capital, favoured him. In fact, they betrayed their country into his hands and welcomed him as its deliverer.† There was a similar division among the Jews settled in Babylonia. Some of them, much as they may have heard of the magnanimity of the Persian king, dreaded his approach.

* *KB.*, iii, 2, 128 *ff.*; Pinches, *OT.*, 411.
† *KB.*, iii, 2, 124 *ff.*, 132 *ff.*; Pinches, *OT.*, 415 *f.*

It is they, perhaps, to whom certain passages in the second part of the book of Isaiah were addressed, notably the following:

9. "Woe to him that striveth with his Maker,—
a potsherd among the potsherds of the ground!
"Doth the clay say to the potter, What makest thou?
or his work, Thou hast no hands?
11. "Thus saith Yahweh,
the Holy One of Israel, even his Maker:
"Of future things ask me,
and concerning the work of my hands command me.
12. "I myself made the earth,
and man on it I created;
"My hands stretched out heaven,
and all its hosts I commanded.
13. "I myself aroused him in righteousness,
and all his ways will I direct;
"He shall build my city,
and all my captives shall he release;
"Not for hire, and not for reward,
saith Yahweh of Hosts." *

There was, however, another party. At any rate, the author of the lines just quoted was enthusiastic in his faith, not only that Cyrus would succeed, but that his success meant deliverance to the Jews in exile. He recognised in the Persian king an instrument of Yahweh. *Cf.* Is. $41^{2\ ff.\ 25}$ 46^{11}. Indeed,—and he must thereby have greatly scandalised many of his countrymen,—he went so far as to identify Cyrus with the Ideal King for whom the Jews had long been praying and looking. *Cf.* Is. 44^{28} 45^{1}. He was so confident of victory for this divinely chosen champion that he boldly foretold the fall of Babylon and exhorted the exiles to prepare for their departure. *Cf.* Is. $46^{1\ f.}$ $47^{1\ ff.}$ $48^{20\ f.}$ 52^{11}. Finally, he predicted that Cyrus, having released them from captivity, would rebuild Jerusalem and restore the temple, its chief ornament. This last prophecy is so important that it deserves to be quoted entire. It runs as follows:

24. "Thus saith Yahweh, thy Redeemer,
and he that formed thee from the womb:

* Is. $45^{9\ ff.}$. On the changes and omissions in the passage as here rendered, *cf.* Cheyne, *SBOT*.

"I am Yahweh, that made all things,
that stretched out heaven alone;
when I spread out the earth who was with me?
25. "That thwarteth the signs of the praters,
and maketh diviners foolish;
"That confuteth the wise,
and turneth their knowledge into folly;
26. "That establisheth the word of his servants,
and fulfilleth the counsel of his messengers;
"That saith of Jerusalem, It shall be peopled
(and of the cities of Judah, Let them be rebuilt),
and its ruins will I restore;
27. "That saith to the deep, Be dry,
and thy streams will I dry up;
28. "That saith of Cyrus, My shepherd,
and all my pleasure shall he fulfil;
"That saith to Jerusalem, Be built,
and to the temple, Be founded." *

Cyrus seems to have more than fulfilled the expectations of his Babylonian partisans. The chronicle to which reference has been made says, "He gave peace to the city; Cyrus proclaimed peace to all Babylonia. Gobryas his lieutenant he appointed governor of Babylon." It adds a most significant item, namely, "From Kislew onward to Adar the gods of Akkad, whom Nabonidus had brought down to Babylon, returned to their cities."† Cyrus, in an inscription of his own, refers to the same matter and claims further credit for restoring both the gods and the people of certain districts on the Tigris to their homes. He adds a prayer that these gods in return may daily remind Bel and Nebo to lengthen his days and bestow upon him their favour.‡

These interesting records must not be misunderstood. They do not mean that at this time the Persian conqueror abandoned the religion of his fathers and adopted that of the Babylonians; but that, being magnanimous by nature, he made it his policy to conciliate his subjects.§ If, however, such was his disposition,

* Is. 44[24 ff.]. Duhm and Cheyne omit the next to the last line and transfer the last to v. [26], but the omission of the fourth line of that verse makes any further pruning unnecessary. On the minor changes in the text, *cf.* Cheyne, *SBOT.*

† *KB.*, iii, 2, 134 *f.*

‡ *KB.*, iii, 2, 126 *f.*: Pinches, *OT.*, 422.

§ On this point Nöldeke has some remarks that are well worth quoting. He says: "If in these two inscriptions (the Chronicle and Cyrus's Cylinder) Cyrus appears as a pious worshipper of the Babylonian gods, and indeed, according to the Cylinder, Merodach himself led him

there is in this fact a warrant for supposing that, unless there were reasons for a different course, he favoured the return of the Jews to their country. He does not mention them among the beneficiaries of his clemency, nor is there, among the known relics of his empire, any record concerning his actual treatment of them. The only direct testimony on the subject is found in the Hebrew Scriptures and works based on them.* The Chronicler, in a passage a part of which is preserved at the end of the second book of Chronicles and the whole at the beginning of the book of Ezra, recites that, in the first year after assuming the government of Babylonia, Cyrus issued a formal proclamation announcing that "Yahweh, the God of heaven," had given him "all the kingdoms of the earth" and commissioned him "to build him a house in Jerusalem"; summoning the Jews who were moved so to do† to return to their country and assist in the project; and commanding the neighbours of those who responded to the call to provide them with "silver, and gold, and cattle, together with a freewill offering for the house of God . . . in Jerusalem." The author adds (vv. [5 ff.]) that these instructions were loyally fulfilled, and that a company of exiles under Sheshbazzar "were brought up," with "the vessels of the house of Yahweh," "from Babylon to Jerusalem." The number of those who took advantage of this opportunity to return to Palestine is said to have been 42,360, besides their servants and a company of singers. *Cf.* Ezr. 2[64 ff.].

The release of the Jews, with permission to rebuild their temple, is so thoroughly in harmony with the policy of Cyrus that one is disposed to accept the Chronicler's account without question. When, however, one examines it more closely, there appear rea-

because he (Merodach) was angry with the native king for not serving him properly, sacerdotal diplomacy of this sort should not deceive the trained historian. The priests turned to the rising sun without regard to their previous relations with Nabonidus. Cyrus certainly did not suppress the Babylonian religion, as the Hebrew prophets expected; the splendour of the ritual in the richest city in the world probably impressed him. When, however, the priests (by whom the inscriptions were prepared) represent him as an adherent of the Babylonian religion, that does not make him one, any more than Cambyses and some of the Roman emperors are made worshippers of the Egyptian gods by being represented on some of the monuments of the land of the Nile as paying them due reverence just like Egyptian kings." *APG.*, 22.

* 1 Esd. 2; Jos.[Ant.], xi, 1.

† There is no such modifying clause in the Massoretic text of Ezr. 1[3], but it is easily supplied from v. [5] and must be restored to complete the meaning. See Guthe, *SBOT.*

sons for more or less skepticism. Kosters, as the result of his investigations, not only doubts the historicity of Cyrus's decree, but declares that "in the history of the Restoration of Israel this return must take, not the first, but the third place"; and that "the temple was built and the wall of Jerusalem restored before the exiles returned from Babylonia."* Meyer is less radical, but he, while he contends for the historicity of the return under Cyrus, characterises this account of it as a fabrication.† There are several reasons for suspecting its authenticity: 1. The language used in the decree is not that of a genuine document emanating from the king of Persia, but of a free composition from the hand of the Chronicler, as in the verses describing the fulfilment of its requirements.

2. The thought dominant in the decree does not properly represent Cyrus as he appears in undoubtedly genuine contemporary records. Thus, at the very beginning he is made to call Yahweh "the God of heaven," and claim that he (Yahweh) has given him "all the kingdoms of the earth"; which amounts to a confession that the God of the Jews is the ruler of the world and the only true God. Now, it is improbable that he would have made any such announcement. He could not have done so without seriously offending the Babylonians. Had he not, in the inscription already cited, given to Marduk the title "king of the gods," and said that it was this Babylonian divinity who predestined him to "the sovereignty of the world"?‡ If, therefore, he issued a decree permitting the return of the Jews, it must have been in a different form from that which has been preserved by the Chronicler.

3. Those who deny that the Jews returned to Palestine, in any such numbers as are given in Ezr. 2, in the first year of Cyrus, call attention to the fact that, in chs. 5 and 6, where this decree is cited, the erection of the temple and the restoration of the sacred vessels are the only matters to which it is represented as referring. *Cf.* $5^{13\,ff.}$ $6^{3\,ff.}$.§

4. Although the document reproduced in Ezr. 2, with its various classes and precise figures, reads like a transcript from a detailed report of the number and character of the exiles who re-

* *WI.*, 2. † *EJ.*, 72, 49. ‡ *KB.*, iii, 2, 120 *ff.* § Kosters, *WI.*, 26.

turned to their country under the terms of the decree attributed to Cyrus, a critical examination renders this view untenable. The reasons for a different opinion are: (*a*) that in the title (Ezr. 2^{1}) the persons enumerated are described as "children of the province" who "had returned to Jerusalem and Judah," that is, were settled in the country when the census was made; (*b*) that the same document, in a somewhat earlier form, is found in Ne. 7, where (v. ^{5}) it is called "a book of genealogy," that is, a genealogical register; (*c*) that the phrase, "of them that came up at the first," here found, is an interpolation,* and the list of leaders in both Ezr. 2 and Ne. 7 also evidently an afterthought;† (*d*) and that, if this list were retained, it could be used as proof of a great return in the first year of Cyrus only on the mistaken supposition that Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel are different names for the same person.‡ These considerations oblige one to confess that the document in question was not intended for its present connection, and that therefore it cannot be used to prove that any great number of Jews, by permission of Cyrus, returned to their country soon after the capture of Babylon.§

5. It appears from Zc. 6^{10} that the Jews of Babylonia were free to return to Jerusalem when it was written, but neither this prophet nor Haggai betrays any knowledge of so great a movement as that described in the first two chapters of Ezra. In fact, Zc. $2^{10/6\,ff.}$, where Zion is exhorted to "flee" from Babylon, indicates that no such movement had taken place when this passage was written. *Cf.* also Zc. 6^{15} $8^{7\,f.}$.

These are the most serious objections to the Chronicler's account of the return of the Jews under Cyrus. They do not lie

* It cannot be construed with the preceding context. *Cf.* Guthe. *SBOT.*

† *Cf.* Guthe, *SBOT.*

‡ This view was formerly common, and there are some who still hold it. So Ryle, on Ezr. 1^{8}; van Hoonacker, *PP.*, 543. The following points, however, seem conclusive against it: (1) The Chronicler, who alone has the name Sheshbazzar, gives his reader no hint that it is intended to designate the same person as Zerubbabel. (2) In Ezr. 5^{16} he represents the leaders of the Jews as using the name in such a way that it cannot fairly be understood as a designation for one of their own number. (3) If, as Meyer (*EJ.*, 77) and others claim, the Shenazzar of 1 Ch. 3^{18} is Sheshbazzar, the author must be reckoned a positive witness against the identity of the person so called with Zerubbabel. *Cf. DB.*, art. *Sheshbazzar.*

§ In 1 Esd. 5 the same document appears as a part of an account of a return with Zerubbabel at the beginning of the reign of Darius.

against a less spectacular view of the matter, derived, not from the prophecies of the Second Isaiah,* but from more nearly contemporary sources. 1. In the first place, as has already been suggested, the liberality of which Cyrus gives evidence in his memorial inscription would prompt him to favour the return of the Jews to their country. 2. It would also suit his plans against Egypt to have them re-establish themselves on the western border of his empire under his protection. 3. Again, the decree cited in Ezr. $5^{13 \text{ ff.}}$, which makes the impression of a genuine document, although there is no mention of the release of the captives, implies that they were by the same instrument, or had been by another, permitted to return to Palestine, since it would have been mockery to order the restoration of the temple without allowing them to go to worship at its altar. 4. Finally, since most, if not quite all, of the better class of inhabitants had been carried into captivity by Nebuchadrezzar, the fact that at the beginning of the reign of Darius there were princes of the house of David as well as priests and prophets resident at Jerusalem† shows that a royal edict permitting them to return had then been in operation for some time. Taking these factors into account, and remembering that, according to Ezr. 6^2, the record of the alleged decree was finally found in Ecbatana, it seems safe to conclude that, after settling the affairs of Babylonia, the king, early in 538 B.C., retired to Ecbatana, whence he issued orders releasing the Jews from captivity and instructing Sheshbazzar to rebuild their temple and restore its sacred vessels; and that from this time onward they could, and did, return, as they were moved so to do, to their native land.‡

The Chronicler does not say when the Jews started from Babylonia, or when they arrived in Palestine; but in Ezr. 3 he informs the reader that, "when the seventh month was come," they "were in the cities," and that on the first of the month Joshua and Zerubbabel had rebuilt the altar at Jerusalem, so that they could offer

* Compare the phraseology of Ezr. $1^{1 \text{ ff.}}$ with that of Is. 41^2 and 44^{28}.

† Hg. 1^1 $2^{1 \text{ f.}}$, etc.

‡ *Cf.* Meyer, *EJ.*, $47^{\text{ f.}}$ André (83 *ff.*) supposes two distinct expeditions to have been organised, the first of which left Babylonia under Sheshbazzar soon after the decree was issued, the second under the twelve elders, among whom were Zerubbabel and Joshua, somewhat later.

the daily sacrifice and observe the feasts in their seasons. Now, there is nothing surprising in this statement, so far as its main features, the restoration of the altar and the resumption of worship, are concerned, but some of its details seem incredible. In the first place, note that Ezr. 3^{1} is evidently an adaptation of Ne. 7^{73b} and 8^{1a}, while the date for the resumption of worship (v. ^{6}) seems to have been borrowed from Ne. 8^{2}. Again, observe that Sheshbazzar, at this time governor of Judea, who had been commissioned by Cyrus to rebuild the temple, and who, according to Ezr. 5^{16}, actually "laid the foundations of the house of God," is not mentioned in this connection. Finally, consider how strange it is that the Jews should be described (v. ^{3}) as urged by the fear of "the peoples of the countries," although they must have had the protection of the governor and a considerable force of Persian soldiers. These discrepancies, especially in view of the phraseology employed,* indicate that here, again, the Chronicler is reconstructing history, this time in the interest of his favourites, Joshua and Zerubbabel, the truth being that the great altar was rebuilt by Sheshbazzar, and that this is what is meant by ascribing to him the foundation of the temple in Ezr. 5^{16}.†

Ezr. 3, from v. ^{8} onward, is devoted to a description of the laying of the foundation of the second temple. In this passage, also, the Chronicler is composing freely, aided to some extent by extant materials, including the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. The phraseology is his‡ and the content is characteristic. The leader in this case is Zerubbabel. Had not Zechariah (4^{9}) said that Zerubbabel had laid the foundation of the house? He is assisted, as one would expect, by Jeshua (Joshua), son of Jehosadak, the high priest, whom the prophets named associate with him. The date given was probably suggested by that of the actual foundation in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah. It is the second year, not, however, of Darius, but, that the prophecy of Is. 44^{28} might be fulfilled, of Cyrus. The names of the heads

* The expressions characteristic of the style of the Chronicler are the following: *set up* and *countries*, v. ^{3}; *each day*, lit., *day with day*, v. ^{4}; *willingly offered*, v. ^{5}: *cf.* Driver, *LOT.*^{6}, 535 *ff.*

† *Cf.* Meyer, *EJ.*, 44 *f.*

‡ *Cf.* *house of God* and *appoint*, v. ^{8}; *have the oversight*, vv. $^{8\,f.}$; *after the order*, v. ^{10}; *praising and giving thanks*, v. ^{11}; further, Driver, *LOT.*^{6}, 434 *ff.*

of the Levites (v. ^{9}) were taken from 2^{40},* the author overlooking the fact that, on his own interpretation, it was not the persons bearing these names, but their sons, who were contemporaries of Zerubbabel. The functions of the Levites are the same here as in other passages in which the Chronicler deals with affairs of the temple. *Cf.* 2 Ch. $24^{5.\ 11}$ $34^{9.\ 12}$. It is characteristic, too, for him to introduce music "after the order of David," whenever there is an opportunity. *Cf.* 1 Ch. $15^{16\text{ ff.}}$ 2 Ch. $5^{11\text{ ff.}}$.† His idea seems to have been to make this occasion correspond in its significance to that when the ark was brought from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem by David. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 16. Finally, the Chronicler describes the effect produced upon "the old men who had seen the first house" when the foundation of the new one was put into place: the cries of joy and sorrow mingled in a great and indistinguishable "noise." This is a clearly an enlargement upon Hg. 2^{3}. The whole account, then, is simply the product of an attempt to bring the facts with reference to the restoration of the temple into harmony with an unfulfilled prediction on the subject, and has no historic value.

The prolepsis just noted made it necessary for the Chronicler to explain why the completion of the temple was so long delayed. He had no data for the purpose, but, fortunately, the history of the restoration of the wall of Jerusalem suggested a means by which he could fill the embarrassing interim. *Cf.* Ne. $3^{33\text{ ff.}}/4^{1\text{ ff.}}$ $4^{1\text{ ff.}/7\text{ ff.}}$ $6^{1\text{ ff.}}$. It was the "adversaries" of his people, he says (Ezr. $4^{4\text{ f.}}$), who hindered the work begun the year after their return, just as they afterward did that of Nehemiah. *Cf.* Ne. $4^{5/11}$. He does not at first divulge who these "adversaries" are, but finally he identifies them with the descendants of the heathen with whom the king of Assyria, here Esarhaddon, colonised northern Palestine after the overthrow of the kingdom of Israel. *Cf.* 2 K. $17^{24\text{ ff.}}$. It was they who "frightened" the Jews "from

* For *Judah* read *Hodavyah*. The fourth name, *Henadad*, seems to be a later addition suggested by Ne. $10^{10/9}$.

† In 2 Ch. 34^{12}, where, according to the Massoretic text, the repairs on the temple would seem to have been made to the sound of trumpets and cymbals, the latter half of the verse has probably been added by a thoughtless scribe. *Cf.* Nowack, who thinks the latter half of v. ^{13} also is ungenuine.

building, and hired counsellors against them, to frustrate their purpose, all the days of Cyrus, king of Persia, even to the reign of Darius, king of Persia." The animus of this story is apparent. It breathes the hatred and contempt with which the Jews regarded their northern neighbours. Its unreality is equally evident. The request put into the mouth of these "adversaries" contradicts, not only the term applied to them, but all that is known with reference to their attitude toward the Jews and their sanctuary.* The passage, therefore, does not add to the trustworthiness of the preceding account of the foundation of the temple.

The general statement of Ezr. 4^{5} might have sufficed to bridge the interval between the date there mentioned and that at which, according to the Chronicler, work on the temple was resumed, namely, the second year of the reign of Darius. The author, however, was not content to leave his readers without details. One of the incidents he cites is barely mentioned, the other is given *in extenso*. A certain Rehum and others, of Samaria, it seems, made a formal complaint against the Jews, setting forth that it would be dangerous to allow them to proceed with the operations in which they were engaged. The king, after an investigation, issued the desired decree, whereupon Rehum and his companions "went in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them cease by force and power. Then," says the writer, "ceased the work of the house of God which is at Jerusalem; and it ceased until the second year of Darius, king of Persia." *Cf.* Ezr. $4^{23 f.}$. The natural inference from the last clause is that both incidents were obstacles to the completion of the sanctuary, and that both occurred before the reign of Darius. This, however, is not the case; for it is clear from vv. $^{12 ff.}$ that it was the rebuilding of the city and its wall against which the Samaritans protested, and it is expressly stated that the first complaint was made in the reign of Xerxes, the son of Darius, and the second in that of Artaxerxes,

* *Cf.* Meyer, *GA.*, iii, 191 *f.* There is a similar case in Ne. 2^{20}, where the Chronicler would lead one to infer that the Samaritans had offered to assist Nehemiah in his work; whereas, from documents recently discovered, it is clear that, so far from recognising the pretensions of the Jerusalemites, they favoured local sanctuaries, and recommended the restoration of the one at Elephantine. *Cf.* Sachau, *Report of the Smithsonian Institution for* 1907, 603 *ff.*; Lagrange, in *Revue Biblique*, 1908, 325 *ff.*

his grandson. In other words, the Chronicler, for the purpose of enriching his narrative, here introduces incidents that had nothing to do with the temple, and happened, if they are authentic, many years after it was completed. They may be of value for the period to which they belong, but they have no place in an introduction to the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah.*

The Chronicler, then, has no reliable information concerning the Jews, or their condition and relations, for the period from the first year after the fall of Babylon to the second of the reign of Darius. The annals of Persia are almost as completely silent with reference to them and their country. Their neighbours generally, as vassals of Babylon, had promptly submitted to Cyrus. Gaza, probably at the instigation of the king of Egypt, hesitated; but it, like the Phœnician cities, finally accepted the new order.† A show of force may have been necessary, but soon, so far as Palestine was concerned, the king was free to devote his energies to a war with the Scythians by which, although it cost him his life, he greatly extended and firmly established, in the north and east, the boundaries of his empire.

The death of Cyrus took place in 530 or 529 B.C.‡ By this time a considerable number of Jews must have returned to Pales-

* A suggestion with reference to the text of Ezr. 4[6-10], however, may not be out of order. It is that, in vv. [7 ff.], the author is reporting the transmission by a higher Persian official of the substance of a letter received from a subordinate. The interpretation will then be as follows: In v. [7] the author says that, in the reign of Artaxerxes, Mithredath (Mithridates), originally the only person named, wrote a despatch to the king, of which there was an Aramaic translation. In v. [8] he gives the words with which Mithredath introduces the matter of the letter: "Rehum, the commandant, and Shimshai, the scribe, have written this letter against Jerusalem to Artaxerxes the king, to wit." Then (v. [9]) follows the list of complainants with which the letter began: "Rehum, the commandant, and Shimshai, the scribe, and the rest of their associates," etc. "And now," says Mithredath (v. [11]), by way of introduction to the letter proper, "this is the copy of the letter that thy servants, the men beyond the River, have sent to Artaxerxes the king"; and he gives his master the contents of the letter. It appears from v. [17] that Rehum was an official resident at Samaria. Mithredath, therefore, was probably the incumbent of the fifth satrapy, which included Palestine. According to Meyer his residence was at Aleppo. *Cf. GA.*, ii, 137.

† Nöldeke, *APG.*, 23: Prášek, *GMP.*, i, 232 *f.*, 235.

‡ The latter is the date usually given. So Wiedemann, *GÄ.*, 224 *f.*; Nöldeke, *APG.*, 26. The Ptolemaic Canon, however, places his death in 530, and the contract tablets of the latter part of that year bear the name of his successor. *Cf.* Prášek, *GMP.*, 200, 246 *f.* It is probable, however, that, when Cyrus started on his unhappy expedition against the Massagetæ, he placed the regal authority in the hands of Cambyses, who thus began to reign some months before his father's death. *Cf.* Herodotus, i, 208; vii, 4: Prášek, *GMP.*, i, 242.

tine. Their condition was not an enviable one. Of this one can assure one's self without the help of the Chronicler. In the first place, even if the great altar had been rebuilt, it cannot but have emphasised the desolation by which it was surrounded. Moreover, those who lived at Jerusalem were constantly reminded by the prostrate walls of the present weakness as well as the former strength of their city. Finally, some of the returned exiles were suffering actual want; for, according to Hg. 2^{16} *f.*, when the temple was founded, it had been a long time since there was a normal harvest. Zechariah (8^{10}) bears similar testimony, referring also to the constant annoyance his people had suffered from hostile neighbours. The discouragement that these hard conditions would naturally engender had doubtless found frequent expression. Perhaps, as some scholars incline to believe,* Is. 63 *f.* are among the literary products of the period. At any rate, the sufferers could hardly have put their complaint into more fitting or forceful language. The following lines from ch. 64 are especially appropriate:

8/9. "Be not, Yahweh, very wroth,
    nor remember iniquity forever:
  "Look, see, I pray thee,
    we are all thy people.
9/10. "Thy holy cities have become a desert;
    Zion hath become a desert,
      Jerusalem a waste.
10/11. "Our holy and beautiful house,
    where our fathers praised thee,
      hath been burned with fire,
  "And all that was precious to us
    hath become a ruin.
11/12. "And wilt thou still restrain thyself, Yahweh?
    be quiet? nay, greatly afflict us? †

§ 2. CAMBYSES.

The successor of Cyrus on the throne of Persia was Cambyses. His chief exploit was the conquest of Egypt. It is probable that

* Bleek, *Einl.*, 346.

† Baethgen, with more or less confidence, refers to this period the following Psalms: 16, 41, 56, 57, 59, 64, 79, 85, 120, 123, 124, 125, 127, 131 and 137.

Cyrus had planned the subjugation of this country, and that, at his death, he had bequeathed to his son the duty of punishing Ahmes for joining Crœsus and Nabonidus in a league against him. A second reason for undertaking this enterprise was that the king of Egypt had shown a good degree of vigour and prudence in the recent past. He had compelled the island of Cyprus to pay him tribute,* and contracted an alliance with the Greeks of Cyrene† and Polycrates the tyrant of Samos,‡ thus threatening Persian dominance in Asia Minor. Finally, there was the Achæmenid lust for dominion, which only the conquest of the world could satisfy.

The immediate cause of the breach between the two powers is unknown.§ Whatever it may have been, it must have arisen early in the reign of Cambyses, for by 526 B.C. he was ready for the conflict.** In that year he set in motion his army, which, as it neared Egypt, was supported by a fleet of Greek, Cyprian, and Phœnician vessels that had been collected at Akka.

The Jews must have been deeply interested in this expedition, and equally impressed by its magnitude, as it passed through Palestine. If any of them were disposed to disparage its strength, they were speedily disillusioned, for at Pelusium Cambyses routed the Egyptian army, and shortly afterward, at Memphis, he captured Psammeticus III, the son and successor of Ahmes, thus completing the conquest of the country.††

There is wide disagreement among the authorities with reference to the treatment of the Egyptians and their religion by the conqueror. A nearly contemporary record, the inscription on the statue of Uzahor, says that, when Cambyses had established himself in Egypt, he took an Egyptian prænomen, Mesut-ra, received instruction in the religion of the country, recognised the goddess Neit by purging her temple, restoring its revenues and worship-

* Herodotus, ii, 126. † Herodotus, ii, 181. ‡ Herodotus, iii, 39 *ff*.

§ For the stories with reference to the subject current in the fifth century B.C., *cf*. Herodotus, iii, 1 *ff*.

** Prášek, *GMP*., i, 252. There is difference of opinion with reference to the date. Brugsch (*Hist*., ii, 312 *ff*.) insists that the invasion of Egypt took place in 527 B.C., but Wiedemann (*GÄ*., 226 *ff*.) seems to have shown that he misread Serapeum 354, the inscription on which his conclusion was based. Petrie, *HE*., iii, 360, supports Wiedemann. Duncker's (*HA*., vi, 145) date is 525 B.C.

†† Herodotus, iii, 10 *ff*.

ping at the renovated sanctuary, and finally made offerings to all the other gods that had shrines at Sais.* The story told by Herodotus is very different. He pictures Cambyses as torturing Psammeticus by cruelty to his children, abusing the mummy of the dethroned king's father, fatally wounding the bull in which Apis had recently manifested himself and making sport of the images in the temple of Ptah, the tutelar divinity of Memphis.† The truth seems to be that at first he was disposed to respect the customs and prejudices of the conquered people, but that, after his return from his disastrous expedition against Ethiopia, he treated them and their gods as if they were responsible for its failure. Then, according to Uzahor, there happened "a very great calamity" affecting "the whole land," during which he (Uzahor) "protected the feeble against the mighty." He adds,—and this statement shows that the religious interests of the country had thereby suffered seriously,—that, on the accession of Darius, he was commissioned "to restore the names of the gods, their temples, their endowments and the arrangement of their feasts forever."‡

The reign of Cambyses was not so unfortunate for the Jews. He seems to have continued toward them the policy adopted by his father, a policy which was prudent as well as liberal, in view of his designs against Egypt. When he had conquered that country he gave proof of his favour by sparing their temple at Elephantine.§ If, however, they were cherishing dreams of independence suggested by the earlier prophets, his reputation for jealousy and cruelty must have chilled their ardour and deterred them from activities that could be interpreted to their disadvantage. Moreover, being on the route by which the Persian army entered Egypt, and by which it had to be re-enforced, they must more than once have been obliged to meet requisitions that sorely taxed their slender resources. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is no evidence, in the Scriptures or elsewhere, that, during the reign of

* Petrie, *HE.*, iii, 360 *ff.*

† Herodotus, iii, 14 *ff.*, 27 *ff.*, 37.

‡ *Cf.* Petrie, *HE.*, iii, 362. Jedoniah, in his letter to Bagoses, says that "the temples of the gods of Egypt were all overthrown" by Cambyses. *Report of Smithsonian Institution*, 1807, 603 *ff.*; *Revue Biblique*, 1908, 325 *ff.*

§ *Report of the Smithsonian Institution*, 1907, 603 *ff.*; *Revue Biblique*, 1908, 325 *ff.*

Cambyses, they made any attempt to complete the temple or even to put their city into a defensible condition. If there are any psalms or other literary remains of the period in the Old Testament, they cannot, for obvious reasons, be distinguished from those of the latter part of the reign of Cyrus.

The reckless ways of Cambyses in Eygpt made the name of Persia hated in that country. The murder of his own brother, Bardes, which he had hitherto succeeded in concealing, now bore fruit in the alienation of his own people by the impostor Gomates, who seized the throne of Persia and proclaimed himself the missing son of Cyrus. When the news reached Egypt the king, although he at first shrank from a contest in which success, however he achieved it, meant lasting infamy, at length, by the urgent advice of his counsellors, put himself at the head of his army and started for Persia. When he reached Syria, however, his courage failed him, and, calling together the nobles who attended him, he first confessed the assassination of Bardes and appealed to them to dethrone the usurper, and then committed suicide.* Thus, the Jews must have been among the first to learn of an event of the greatest significance for them and their interests.

§ 3. DARIUS I, HYSTASPES.

Cambyses, who had no son, was finally succeeded by Darius Hystaspes, representing a collateral branch of the Achæmenids. The story of the method by which he obtained the crown, as given by Herodotus,† is full of romantic details. The new king himself, in the inscription already cited, gives this concise and simple account of the matter:

> "There was not a man, either Persian or Median, or any one of our family, who could dispossess of the empire this Gomates, the Magian. The State feared him exceedingly. He slew many people who had known the old Bardes; for this reason he slew the people, lest they should recognise him as

* The statement of Herodotus (*Hist.*, iii, 64), that the death of the king was accidental, is contradicted by the Behistun inscription, in which Darius says expressly that "Cambyses, killing himself, died." *RP.*[2], i, 114.

† *Hist.*, iii, 71 *ff*.

not being Bardes, the son of Cyrus. There was not any one bold enough to say aught against Gomates, the Magian, until I arrived. Then I prayed to Ormazd. Ormazd brought help to me. On the tenth day of the month Ragayadish, then it was that I slew this Gomates, the Magian, and the chief men who were his followers. At the fort named Sictachotes, in the district of Media called Nisæa, there I slew him. I dispossessed him of the empire. By the grace of Ormazd I became king. Ormazd granted me the sceptre."

It was one thing to dispose of Gomates, and quite another, as Darius soon discovered, to get possession of the power that Cambyses had wielded. One after another the principal provinces rebelled, until the whole of the eastern half of the empire, under various leaders, was in arms against him. The following is his catalogue of the insurgents he had to suppress before he could call himself, as he does at the beginning of this Behistun inscription,* "the great king, the king of kings, the king of Persia, the king of the provinces":

"One was named Gomates, the Magian. He was an impostor; he said, I am Bardes, the son of Cyrus. He threw Persia into revolt.

"One, an impostor, was named Atrines, a Susian. He thus said, I am the king of Susiana. He caused Susiana to revolt against me.

"One was named Nadinta-belus, a native of Babylon. He was an impostor. He thus said, I am Nabochodrossor, the son of Nabonidus. He caused Babylon to revolt.

"One was an impostor named Martes, a Persian. He thus said, I am Imanes, the king of Susiana. He threw Susiana into rebellion.

"One was named Phraortes, a Median. He spake lies. He thus said, I am Xathrites, of the race of Cyaxares. He persuaded Media to revolt.

"One was an impostor named Sitratachmes, a native of Sagartia. He thus said, I am the king of Sagartia, of the race of Cyaxares. He caused Sagartia to revolt.

"One was an impostor named Phraates, a Margian. He thus said, I am the king of Margiana. He threw Margiana into revolt.

"One was an impostor named Veisdates, a Persian. He thus said, I am Bardes, the son of Cyrus. He headed a rebellion in Persia.

"One was an impostor named Aracus, a native of Armenia. He thus said, I am Nabochodrossor, the son of Nabonidus. He threw Babylon into revolt."

The courage and vigour that Darius brought to his herculean task are amazing; yet these essential qualities would hardly have availed him, had he not been loyally supported by several able generals, among whom was his own father, Hystaspes. He him-

* *RP.*², i, 126.

self, having apprehended and punished Atrines for claiming the crown of Susiana, turned his attention to Babylonia, where, after fighting two battles, he took the capital and put to death the impostor, Nadinta-belus. While he was thus engaged the rest of the provinces revolted. As soon as he was free to do so he hurried to Media to assist Hydarnes against Phraortes, whom he overthrew in battle and finally executed. While here he sent a force into Sagartia under one of his generals, who defeated Sitratachmes, the usurping king, and brought him back a prisoner. Meanwhile, with some assistance from him, Armenia had been subdued and Hystaspes had restored order in Parthia and Hyrcania. The satrap of Bactria had also suppressed the uprising in Margiana. Finally, Darius himself saw the end of the second in Persia and Arachotia, while Intaphernes was subduing the second in Babylonia.*

The above outline, which is intended merely to indicate the probable order of the events mentioned, might convey an erroneous impression with reference to the duration of the struggle between Darius and his adversaries. It really lasted about three years. There ought to be no difficulty, with the data given, to construct a chronology of his victories; but, unfortunately, although he gives the month and the day of the month in almost every case, he does not mention the year to which these belong, or arrange his narrative so that the omission can always be supplied. Still, it is possible, with the help of Babylonian tablets belonging to the period, to determine approximately a number of important dates. Thus, the impostor Gomates must have set up his claim to the throne of Persia in the spring of 522 B.C.† The death of Cambyses occurred late in the summer of the same year.‡ In the following autumn Gomates was overthrown by Darius,§ who be-

* *RP.*[2], i, 116 *ff.*; Nöldeke, *APG.*, 31 *f.*

† The time of year is determined by a tablet dated in "Airu [April–May], the year of the beginning of the reign of Bardes, king of Babylon, king of the lands." *KB.*, iv, 294 *f.* The year can hardly have been 523 B.C., as Prášek (*GMP.*, i, 266) asserts, since Cambyses must have been informed of the event within a few weeks after it occurred, and must have taken steps to meet the usurper very soon after the receipt of such information. He did not, however, according to Prášek himself (*GMP.*, i, 267) leave Egypt until the spring of 522 B.C. This, therefore, was probably the year of the beginning of Gomates's usurpation.

‡ Prášek, *GMP.*, i, 275.

§ Prášek, *GMP.*, i, 282.

gan his reign before the middle of March, 521 B.C.* Toward the end of this year occurred the first revolt in Babylon, which probably occupied him until the summer of 520 B.C.,† when he went to Media to finish the subjugation of that and the adjoining provinces. The second revolt of the Babylonians, which seems to have been the latest of these protests against the authority of Darius, was probably not suppressed before 519 B.C.‡

If Cambyses died in the summer of 522 B.C. and Gomates was overthrown before the end of the year, the first full year of the reign of Darius began with Nisan (March–April) 521 B.C., and the second with the same month in 520, before he had taken Babylon the first time. Now, "the second year of Darius the king," "the sixth month," and "the first day of the month," or about the middle of August, is the date on which Haggai approached Zerubbabel and Joshua, the then leaders in Jerusalem, with a message from Yahweh requiring them to rebuild the temple, and it was only a few days later that the work was actually begun. *Cf.* Hg. $1^{1.\ 15}$. In other words, the movement among the Jews to rebuild the temple took place just when the latest news from the East seemed to warrant them in expecting the speedy collapse of the Persian empire. This can hardly have been a mere coincidence. It means that, whatever may have been the policy of Cyrus, that of his successor had been more or less repressive, and that the Jews, who, having one of their own race for governor, had now begun to think of autonomy, took the first favourable opportunity to provide a rallying-point for patriotic sentiment in the growing community.

There is no intimation in the prophecies of Haggai or Zechariah that the project they were urging met with any opposition from the Persian government. The Chronicler does not claim that anything was done to hinder it, but he says that the Jews had

* This statement is based on a tablet dated the twenty-second of Adar (February–March) in "the beginning" of his reign. *KB.*, iv, 302 *f.*

† According to Herodotus (iii, 152), the siege of the city lasted a year and seven months.

‡ So Meyer, *GA.*, i, 613 *ff.* Duncker, following Herodotus, prolongs the first Babylonian revolt until the autumn of 519 B.C., making it necessary to suppose that the second was not suppressed until 517 B.C. *Cf. HA.*, vi, 239 *ff.*, 249 *ff.*, 270 *ff.*

no sooner begun work than Tattenai, the governor of the satrapy west of the Euphrates, and certain others, appeared and inquired who had given them authority to rebuild the sanctuary.* They replied that Cyrus had done so in the first year of his reign, and that Sheshbazzar had actually laid the foundations of the building at that time. *Cf.* Ezr. $5^{13.\ 16}$. Thereupon the governor reported to the king, asking that an examination be made to ascertain whether such a decree had ever been issued. *Cf.* Ezr. 5^{17}. The result was that a record to this effect was found at Ecbatana, and the governor was instructed not to interfere with the Jews in their work, but rather to assist them from the revenues of his district, that they might "offer sacrifices of sweet savour to the God of heaven, and pray for the life of the king and his sons." *Cf.* Ezr. $6^{1\ ff.}$.

The authenticity of this account has been disputed by Wellhausen, but the tendency, even among the more radical authorities, is to admit that, whether the Chronicler, to whom it owes its present form, composed (Schrader), compiled (Kosters) or only edited (Kuenen) it, it contains more or less material of a genuinely historical character. This opinion is favoured by the following considerations:

1. The general impression made by the story, as compared, for example, with $1^{1\ f.}$, $4^{7\ ff.}$ or $6^{16\ ff.}$, is that it is temperate and plausible.

2. The consideration shown the Jews, first by the governor, and then by the king, is in harmony with the demands of the historical situation. The whole East had revolted against Darius; but as yet there had been no trouble in the western part of the empire, and it was very desirable that this state of things should continue. That the king realised this is clear from his treatment of the case of Oroetes, the satrap of Lydia, who was not removed, although he was known to be secretly disloyal, until the eastern provinces had been reduced to submission.† Probably Tattenai had re-

* Ezr. 5^{3}. The text adds a clause rendered (after 𝔊 𝔗) in *RV*. "and to finish this wall"; but the vocalisation of אֻשַּׁרְנָא indicates that the Jews read אֻשַּׁיָּא, *foundations*, as in v. [16]. Haupt (*SBOT.*) regards it as the Aramaic form of *asru*, an Assyrian word for *sanctuary*. If *RV*. is correct, the whole clause is probably an accretion.

† Herodotus, iii, 120 *ff*.

ceived instructions to keep a close watch upon his district, but not to create unnecessary friction. When the case came before Darius, he would naturally make it a point to honour a decree of his great predecessor, knowing that, once firmly seated upon his throne, he could easily check any abuse of his liberality by the Jews of Jerusalem.

3. The mention of Sheshbazzar (5^{16}) is significant. It shows that the Chronicler, when he introduced it, was borrowing from an older source, a source from which, in ch. 3, he found reason for differing, and in which, on this account, the reader should have the greater confidence.

4. When the Jews began work on the temple, Media was in rebellion; but, by the time the report of Tattenai reached Darius, he had regained control of the province, including Ecbatana, where the edict of Cyrus was finally discovered. *Cf.* Ezr. 6^{2}.

5. There are certain features of the rescript in reply to Tattenai (Ezr. $6^{6\,ff.}$) that speak for its genuineness. Thus, the request for an interest in the prayers of the worshippers of Yahweh (v. ^{10}) reminds one of Cyrus's appeal to the gods that he had restored to their shrines to intercede for him and Cambyses with Bel and Nebo;* while the warning against tampering with the decree (v. ^{11}) has a parallel in the conclusion of the Behistun inscription where Darius himself says:

"If, seeing this tablet and these figures, thou shalt injure them, and shalt not preserve them as long as thy seed endures, then may Ormazd be thy enemy, and mayest thou be childless, and that which thou mayest do may Ormazd curse for thee."

The curse in v. ^{12}, however, is justly suspected of being an interpolation.†

It must have taken some time, several months, for Tattenai to get his instructions. Meanwhile the Jews proceeded with their work. At first they wrought with feverish, fanatical energy. On the twenty-fourth of the ninth month (December, 520 B.C.), the enthusiasm seems to have reached its height. This is the date on which Haggai prophesied the destruction of "the strength of the kingdoms of the nations." *Cf.* 3^{22}. Later the work began

* *KB.*, iii, 2, 126 *f.*

† Meyer, *EJ.*, 51.

to drag. At any rate, Zechariah, in 4[6 f.] of his prophecies, pictures the task before Zerubbabel and his associates as a "mountain." If they finally received any assistance from the government, it must have been delayed many months, as such grants are apt to be, for, according to the Chronicler (Ezr. 6[15]), the temple was not completed until the third of Adar in the sixth year of Darius, or February, 515 B.C.

For some time after the suppression of the great uprising in the East Darius was employed in strengthening his hold on his vast dominions. To this end he removed ambitious satraps, like Oroetes, occupied strategic points in India and Asia Minor and thoroughly reorganised the empire. In the course of these activities he had to devote some attention to Egypt, where Aryandes, an appointee of Cambyses, was usurping royal functions and provoking disorder. Perhaps he had already sent Uzahor, an official already (p. 15) mentioned, to repair some of the damage done to the country by his predecessor.* Finally he himself visited Egypt. There is no direct evidence bearing on the date of this visit, but Wiedemann,† by combining an inscription recording the death of an Apis with a notice by Polyænus‡ of a reward offered by the king for the discovery of another, has made it appear that it was, or began, in his fourth year, that is 517 B.C.§ His first act was to depose and execute the satrap. Then he proceeded to restore order, institute necessary reforms, and otherwise display his wisdom and efficiency as a ruler. The greatest of his undertakings was the canal by which he planned to connect the Nile with the Red Sea, and thus open communication by water between Persia and the Mediterranean.**

The presence of Darius in the West was a boon, not only to Egypt, but to Palestine. He may have visited Jerusalem as he passed through the country and, having personally inspected the rising temple, made further provision for its completion. At any

* The country from which Darius sent Uzahor on this mission, according to Petrie (*HE.*, iii, 362), was Aram, Syria, but, according to Brugsch (*Hist.*, ii, 305), Elam.

† *GÄ.*, 236 *f.* ‡ vii, 11, 7. § So also Nöldeke, *APG.*, 41.

** Wiedemann, *GÄ.*, 241 *f.* The project was abandoned because Darius's engineers told him that the level of the Red Sea was higher than that of Egypt and that, therefore, if the canal were opened the country would be flooded.

rate, the latest of Zechariah's prophecies, which is dated in the fourth year of Darius (7^1), in its tone and content indicates improved conditions. It is evident that, when it was written, the Jews, who had previously been almost entirely confined to Jerusalem, and constantly annoyed, as they went and came, by the "adversary," had begun to occupy the surrounding country and enjoy the fruits of order and security. *Cf.* $8^{10\,ff.}$. Their ideas had meanwhile changed with their circumstances. They had laid aside, for the time being, their political aspirations,—Zerubbabel is not mentioned,—content that Jerusalem should be, not the capital of a great, independent kingdom, but, as in the visions of the Second Isaiah, a sanctuary for all nations. *Cf.* $8^{22\,f.}$. Note, too, the emphasis the prophet, in chs. 7 *f.*, lays upon justice, mercy, etc., and the clearness with which he teaches that the practice of these homely virtues is the condition of the continued enjoyment by the individual and the community of the favour of Yahweh.

HAGGAI AND HIS PROPHECIES.

§ 1. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE PROPHET.

The prophet Haggai is known only through his book. True, he is mentioned with Zechariah in Ezr. 5^1 and 6^{14}, but the statements there found are so clearly based on the book attributed to him that they are of no value except to show that a writer about the beginning of the third century B.C. believed him to have been a historical character. Nor is there any direct information in the book of Haggai with reference to the origin or personal history of its author. In most other cases the name of the prophet's father is given (Is. 1^1), or that of the place of his birth or residence (Am. 1^1), or both (Je. 1^1); but here both are omitted. This fact, together with the further circumstance that the Hebrew word *ḥaggay** may mean *my feasts*, gives some plausibility to the hypothesis† that this book, like that of Malachi, was originally an anonymous work, and that the name *Haggai*, more correctly, *Haggay*, was given to it because the prophecies it contained were all dated on feast-days. The name *Haggai*, however, differs from *Malachi* in that, as will be shown in the comments, it can be referred to a numerous class having the same form. Moreover, while it is true that the first of the prophecies attributed to Haggai was delivered on the first of the month, and the second on the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles,‡ there is, as André himself admits, no evidence that the twenty-fourth of the ninth was ever celebrated as a festival by the Hebrews. There is, therefore, as good ground for accepting the historical reality of Haggai as that, for example, of Habakkuk.

There was current among the early Christians a more or less

* חַגַּי.   † André, 8.

‡ In the earliest references to this feast it is not dated, but from the time of Ezechiel onward it began on the fifteenth of the seventh month. *Cf.* Ez. 45^{25}; Lv. 23^{33}; *EB.*, art. *Feasts*, § 11; Nowack, *Arch.*, ii, 180.

distinct tradition to the effect that Haggai was of priestly lineage. It appears in a statement of a certain Dorotheus, whom Delitzsch* identifies with a bishop of Tyre of the same name, that, when Haggai died, "he was buried with honour near the sepulchre of the priests, where the priests were customarily buried;"† but it is given in a more complete form by Hesychius, who says that the prophet "was buried near the sepulchre of the priests with honour, like them, because he was of priestly stock."‡ It should also be noted as in harmony with this tradition that, in the versions, the name of Haggai appears in the titles of some of the Psalms.§ This external testimony is not in itself of so much value, but it would deserve more serious consideration if there were internal evidence to support it. There are those who claim that there is such evidence. They find it, first, in the tone and purpose of the book, which seems to them to betray the personal interest of a priest in the restoration of the worship by which his order had subsisted before the Exile;** and, second, in the prophet's familiarity, as displayed in $2^{11\,ff.}$, with matters on which he himself represents the priests as the recognised authorities. These reasons, however, are not convincing, especially in view of the fact that Jewish tradition, although it highly honours Haggai, attributing to him and Zechariah and Malachi, with whom he is almost always associated, various important services,†† does not reckon him a member of the sacerdotal order. On the whole, therefore, it seems safest to ignore the Christian tradition and regard the prophet as a patriotic Jewish layman of unusual zeal for, and therefore, perhaps, unusual acquaintance with, the religion in which he had been born and reared.‡‡

* *De Habacuci Propheta Vita atque Ætate*, 54 *ff*.

† *Maxima Bibliotheca Veterum Patrum*, iii, 422 *ff*. *Cf*. also Epiphanius, *De Vitis Prophetarum*, ed. Petavius, ii, 235 *ff*.

‡ *Critica Sacra*, viii, Para. ii, col. 33.

§ In 𝔊, 137 (138) and 145–149 (146–149); in 𝔖, 125 *f*. (126 *f*.) 145–148 (146–148); in 𝔗, 64 (65); in 𝔙, 111 (112) 145 *f*. (146 *f*.).

** André, 98 *ff*.

†† They are said to have transmitted the Law to the men of the Great Synagogue, assisted Jonathan ben Uziel in the composition of his Targum on the prophets, introduced the final letters into the Hebrew alphabet, rendered various sage decisions, etc. For numerous citations, *cf*. André, 13 *ff*.

‡‡ Marti claims that $2^{11\,ff.}$, so far from indicating that Haggai was a priest, favours the contrary opinion.

The Christian writers above cited agree in teaching that Haggai was born in Babylon. Dorotheus, Epiphanius and others say that he was still a young man when he came to Jerusalem.* Augustine, however, had somewhere learned that both Haggai and Zechariah had prophesied in Babylon before they and their countrymen were released from captivity.† The Jewish authorities, also, seem to have thought of Haggai as a man of mature, if not advanced, age when he arrived in Palestine. Otherwise they would not have attributed to him the wisdom and influence for which they gave him credit. Ewald and other modern commentators think he may have been among those who had seen the temple of Solomon before its destruction. *Cf.* 2^{3}. If so, he must have been between seventy and eighty years of age when his prophecies were uttered. Perhaps his age explains why his prophetic career was so brief. At any rate, it seems to have been brought to a close shortly after the foundations of the new sanctuary were laid, while Zerubbabel was still governor of Jerusalem.

§ 2. THE BOOK OF HAGGAI.

The book of Haggai consists largely of a series of four comparatively brief prophecies, all dated, the last two on the same day. It is evidently not, in its entirety, from the prophet's own hand; for, both in the statements by which the several prophecies are introduced (1^{1} $2^{1.\ 10.\ 20}$) and in the body of the third ($2^{13\ f.}$), he is referred to only in the third person. Moreover, the first prophecy is followed by a description of its effect upon those to whom it was addressed (1^{12-15}) throughout which he is treated in the same objective manner. There are similar passages in Zechariah; a fact which has led Klostermann to conclude that the book of Haggai and Zc. 1–8 originally belonged to an account of the rebuilding of the temple in the reign of Darius, chronologically arranged and probably edited by Zechariah.‡ This thesis, however, cannot be maintained; for, in the first place, as will be shown in the comments on 1^{15}, the point on which Klostermann bases his supposition,

* For the text of these references, *cf.* Köhler, 6 *f.*

† *Enarrationes in Ps.* cxlvii.

‡ *GVI.*, 212 *f.*

that the combined works of the two prophets once had a chronological arrangement, is mistaken, and, second, Budde has made it pretty clear that the narrative portions of Zc. 1–8, in their present form, were not written by the author of the prophecies.* In fact, it is possible to go still farther and say that, if Budde is correct in his analysis, Rothstein's less definite form of this hypothesis† also becomes untenable, the difference between the narrative portions of the books of Haggai and Zechariah being so marked that they cannot all be attributed to any single author. While, therefore, it is necessary to admit that the book of Haggai is his only in the sense that it contains his extant prophecies, it is equally necessary to insist that it is, and was intended to be, a separate literary production.

The book is so brief that it seems almost ridiculous to suspect its unity. Yet some have not only raised the question, whether all the prophecies it contains are correctly attributed to Haggai, but actually found reasons for answering it in the negative. The most ambitious of these critics is André, who claims (24 *ff.*) to have shown that 2^{10-19} is an interpolation, being, in fact, a prophecy delivered by an unknown person on the twenty-fourth of the ninth month, not of the second, but of the first, year of the reign of Darius. The following is an outline of his argument for this contention: 1. The passage interrupts the development of the preceding discourse, the conclusion of which is found in vv. $^{21-23}$. 2. The point of view in this passage is different from that of the rest of the book. 3. This message is addressed *to* Haggai, not, like the others, to the leaders and the people *through* him. 4. There are palpable contradictions between it and other portions of the book. 5. The vocabulary of these verses is different from that of the rest of the book. These statements, if they were all correct and relevant, would be conclusive against the genuineness of the passage in question. This, however, is not the case. In fact, in every instance either the allegation or the inference from it is mistaken. Thus, although 2^{21} repeats a clause from v. ^{6}, the fact that vv. $^{21\,ff.}$ are addressed to Zerubbabel alone makes it a distinct prophecy, which, moreover, could not have been attached immediately to

* *ZAW.*, 1906, 1 *ff.*

† *KJ.*, 46 *f.*

v.[9] without producing confusion.* The second statement is based on an exaggerated notion of the subtlety of the illustration used in $2^{12\,ff.}$; which, according to André, betrays the priestly legalist. It is really, as will be shown in the comments, a figure that might have occurred to any Jew zealous for his religion in the days of the prophet. The third point touches the style, not of Haggai, but of the editor by whom his prophecies were collected. Moreover, as will be shown, the original reading in 2^{1} was *to*, not *by Haggai*, and, when this correction is made, the alleged discrepancy has disappeared. The contradictions to which André refers under his fourth head he finds in $2^{17.\,18}$, on the one hand, compared with $1^{10\,f.\,15}$ on the other. For the solution of these difficulties, see the comments on the passages cited. There are, as André, fifthly, asserts, differences of phraseology between 2^{10-19} and the rest of the book, but there is not a case having any significance in which the word or phrase employed cannot be better explained than by calling it a mark of difference in authorship.

There is really no necessity for discussing the thirteen specifications under this head, but perhaps it should be done for the sake of showing how little science is sometimes mixed with criticism. The following are the words and phrases cited, with the reason, when there is one, for the use of each of them in the given connection:

a. The use of היכל, *temple*, in $2^{15.\,18}$ for the more general term בית, *house*, of $1^{2.\,14}$ has no critical significance. It is used in a precisely similar connection, and exclusively, four times in Zc. 6^{9-15}, and with בית in Zc. 8^{9}. *b*. In 2^{14} יגיע, which means *wearisome toil*, and, when the instrument is to be expressed, is always followed by כף, *palm*, as in 1^{11}, would not have been general enough; hence the use of מעשה ידיהם, *work of their hands*. *c*. In 2^{12} *oil* is called שמן, and not, as in 1^{11}, יצהר, because it is regarded as a commodity rather than a product of the soil. *d*. The same explanation applies to the use of יין, *wine*, for תירוש, *must*. *e*. The use of מגורה, *granary*, for the בית, *house*, *home*, in 2^{19} is explained by the fact that the author is here thinking of grain in storage, and not, as in 1^{9}, on its way from the field or the threshing-floor. *f*. The word בגר is the proper one for a single garment. Hence it, and not לבוש, which generally means *clothing*, is used in 2^{12}, and often elsewhere, even in connection with the verb לבש, *clothe*, of 1^{6}. *Cf*. Zc. 3^{3}. *g*. In 2^{14} גוי, *nation*, is used of Israel, because a synonym is needed for עם, *people*. *Cf*. Ex. 33^{13}. This is not the case anywhere else in the book. *Cf*. $1^{2.\,12.\,13.\,14}$ 2^{4}. *h*. If in 2^{14} the writer had had a verb denoting *fear*, he would

* André claims that vv. $^{20.\,21b}$, as well as v. ^{10}, were added to the text when vv. $^{11-19}$ were inserted.

probably have used מפני instead of לפני for *before*, just as he does in 1^{12}. *i*. The omission of עַל־דרכיכם in $2^{15.18}$ is due to the fact that here the verb has another object. *Cf.* $1^{5.7}$. *k*. The use of יהוה without צבאות in $2^{14.17}$ would have more significance if the last clause of v. [17] were undoubtedly genuine and Haggai did not employ the simple name three times ($2^{4(bis).23}$) outside the passage under consideration. See also 1^{13}, an interpolation. *l*. The omission of his title after the name of the prophet in $2^{13\,f.}$ is just what one would expect in a passing reference. *Cf.* Böhme, *ZAW.*, 1887, 215. Elsewhere the title is used; except in 2^{20}, and there, on the testimony of 𝔊, it should be. *Cf.* $1^{1.3.12}$ 2^{1}. *m*. The priests appear in $2^{11\,ff.}$, because the question is one that not only the high priest, but any of his associates, ought to be able to answer. In all cases where the high priest is introduced, he, like Zerubbabel, is a representative figure. *Cf.* $1^{1.12.14}$ 2^{2}. *n*. The case of, אל, *to*, for ביד, *by*, has already been discussed under point 3, p. 28.

In view of this showing it is not strange that André's hypothesis has met with little favour from biblical scholars.*

There is one other extended passage, 2^{20-23}, whose genuineness has been questioned by W. Böhme (*ZAW.*, 1887, 215 *ff.*).

He mentions incidentally the omission of the title after the name of the prophet in v. [20], laying the stress of objection upon (1) the use of the construction *to* (אל) for *by* (ביד; lit. *by the hand of*) in the same verse, and (2) the unnecessary repetition in v. [21] of a prophecy found in $2^{6b.7a}$, which, according to $2^{2.4}$, Zerubbabel had already heard. These objections, however, are easily answered. The missing title is found in 𝔊; the construction with *to* is the one that was originally used in vv. [1. 10]; and the repetition of v. ^{6b}, or rather, v. ^{6ba},—v.^{7a} is not so literally reproduced,—is simply a device for connecting the fortunes of Zerubbabel with the same events for which the prophet had sought to prepare the people. The weakness of Böhme's argument is apparent. This, however, is not all. He has overlooked the fact that Zerubbabel was removed soon after Haggai ceased to prophesy, and that, therefore, his theory, as Marti remarks, implies that this final prophecy was added by a writer who knew that it could not be fulfilled.

§ 3. THE TEXT OF HAGGAI.

The book of Haggai, then, as a whole, may be regarded as a genuine collection of the words of the prophet whose name it bears. It can hardly contain all that he said on any of the four occasions on which he is reported to have spoken, much less all that he said during the months when he was labouring for the restoration of the national sanctuary. The meagreness of the

* For a more severe criticism of it, see G. A. Smith on Haggai in *The Expositor's Bible*.

remains of his teachings, and the setting in which they have been preserved, may be explained by supposing that he himself did not commit his discourses to writing, but that a friend or a disciple, who had treasured his most striking or important utterances, soon after his death* put them into nearly the shape in which they have been preserved. It is necessary to use some such qualifying term as *nearly* in any statement with reference to the book, because, although, as has been shown, its unity as a literary production is perfectly defensible, there can be no doubt that, like other parts of the Old Testament, it has suffered more or less in the course of the centuries at the hands of careless or ignorant readers or transcribers. Some of the resulting additions, omissions, and corruptions can easily be detected and remedied. In other cases changes that have taken place reveal themselves only to the trained critic, and by signs that will not always convince the layman, especially if he is interested in a diverse opinion. This, however, is not the place for a further discussion of the subject. It belongs in the exegetical, but more especially in the critical, notes, where the renderings of the great Versions, as well as the readings of the Hebrew manuscripts and editions, will be cited and compared and the conjectures of the leading biblical scholars, past and present, considered. The most that can be done in this connection is to present in tabular form the results reached in the notes for the purpose of indicating the condition of the Hebrew text. In the first column of the following tables are noted the additions that seem to have been made to the book since it was written, in the second the words and phrases, so far as they can be recovered, that appear to have been omitted, and in the third the cases in which the original has been wittingly or unwittingly distorted in the course of transmission.

* The fact that all the prophecies are carefully and, so far as can be determined, correctly dated indicates that the book was compiled within a few years, at the longest, after they were delivered.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
1, 1. יום		
2. עת[1]		בא for בָא.
3. The entire verse.		
4.		בתיכם for בתים.
5.		
6.		
7.		
8. אמר יהוה	על after עלו.	הבאתם for בראתם; ואכבר for ואכברה.
9.		
10. עליכם	ה before שמים.	מטל for מטר.
11.	כל before אשר.	כפים for כפיהם.
12.	פחת יהודה. אליהם after אלהיהם[2].	ועל for ואל.
13. The entire verse.		
14.		
15. בששי		The transfer of v. [b] from 2[1].
2, 1.		ביד for אל.
2.	כל before שארית.	שלתיאל for שאלתיאל.
3.		
4.		

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	CORRUPTIONS.
1, 1. *day.*		
2. *a time.*		*to come* for *hath come.*
3. The whole verse.		
4.		*your houses* for *houses.*
5.		
6.		
7.		
8. *said Yahweh.*	*upon* before *the mountains.*	*bring* for *cut; and I shall* for *that I may.*
9.		
10. *over you.*	art. before *heaven.*	*dew* for *rain.*
11.	*all* before *that.*	*hands* for *their hands.*
12.	*pasha of Judah; to them* after *him.*	*according to* for *to* before *the words.*
13. The whole verse.		
14.		
15. *sixth.*		The transfer of v. [b] from 2^1.
2, 1.		*by* for *to.*
2.	*all* before *the rest.*	*Shaltiel* for *Shealtiel.*
3.		
4.		

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
2, 5. v. ° entire.		
6. אחת ואת־הים ואת־החרבה		
7. אמר יהוה צבאות		חֶמְדַּת for חֲמוּדֹת.
8.	כי before לי.	
9. אמר יהוה צבאות		
10. בשנת שתים לדריוש		ביד for אל, in some mss.
11. כה אמר יהוה צבאות		
12.		
13.	ה before שמן.	
14.		
15. מן־היום הזה ומעלה		אל for עַל.
16. פורה		מהיותם for בהיות ימי.
17. ואין־אתכם אלי נאם יהוה		אתכם for שבכם.
18. מיום ע״ ואי״ לתשיעי		
19.		ועַד for ועֹד; נשא for נשאו.
20.	הנביא after חגי.	
21.	בן שאלתיאל	
22. ממלכות[2] איש בחרב אחיו	ה before ממלכות[1]	
23.		

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	CORRUPTIONS.
2, 5. *which thing—Egypt.*		
6. *once; yea, the sea and the dry land.*		
7. *said Yahweh of hosts.*		*desire* for *treasures.*
8.	*for* before *mine.*	
9. *said Yahweh of hosts.*		
10. *in the second year of Darius.*		*by* for *to*, in some mss.
11. *Thus said Yahweh of hosts.*		
12.		
13.	art. before *oil.*	
14.		
15. *from this day forward.*		*to* for *upon.*
16. *winepress.*		*since they were* for *during the days.*
17. *but ye did not return to me, saith Yaweh.*		
18. *from the twenty-fourth of the ninth month.*		
19.		*and until* for *nor yet.*
20.	*the prophet* after *Haggai.*	*has* for *have borne.*
21.	*son of Shealtiel* after *Zerubbabel.*	
22. *kingdoms of the* before *nations; each by the sword of his fellow.*	art. before *kingdoms.*[1]	
23.		

§ 4. THE THOUGHT AND STYLE OF HAGGAI.

It has long been the fashion to disparage the book of Haggai, and some of the later biblical scholars are almost as severe in their criticism of it as were, in their day, Gesenius and de Wette.

Thus, Marti says of the content of the prophecies: "The temple is to be built and salvation is near. From this fundamental thought, especially when combined with the prophecies of the Second Isaiah, all of Haggai's ideas may easily be derived. It is clear that he does not belong to the original men who were able by interior illumination to comprehend the world and its condition in their judgments, but to the feebler descendants to whom light streams from the words of the earlier prophets." Reuss has a similar opinion of Haggai's literary ability. These are his words: "He generally falls into the most colourless prose; and if he a couple of times, at the end of the second division, and in the fourth, strikes a higher key and rises to poetically flowery language, one sees that this does not flow from a living spring." The mixture of figures into which the critic himself here "falls" rather detracts from his authority in matters of style. Cornill is more appreciative. He says: "The little book . . . occupies but a modest place in the prophetic literature of Israel. It rises hardly above plain prose, but in its very simplicity and unpretentiousness, because the author speaks from a deeply moved heart in an affecting situation, it has something uncommonly attractive and affecting that should not be overlooked." *

The truth is that there is hardly a sufficient basis for a very definite and decisive opinion with reference to Haggai and his prophecies. In the first place, let it be noted, the book that bears his name, next to Obadiah, is the smallest in the Old Testament; secondly, small as it is, only about two-thirds of it can be attributed to the prophet; and, thirdly, these brief fragments, in passing through the hands of an editor, may have lost more or less of the impress of Haggai's personality. This being the case, criticism should confine itself to the more salient features of the book; for the more minute the analysis the further it is likely to be from the truth.

The central thought of the prophet is too prominent to be overlooked. He was inspired with the irrepressible desire to see the temple rebuilt, and he set himself the task of persuading his people to restore it. In the pursuit of this purpose he used the same

* *Einl.*[5], 213.

means that his predecessors had employed, tracing past misfortunes to neglect of a, to him, plain duty, and thus by implication threatening further calamities if this neglect continued, but promising the most tempting blessings if the opposite course were taken. This, it is true, is a rather narrow program for a prophet, but if, as can doubtless be shown, in Haggai's time the future of the little community in Jerusalem and their religion was involved in the question of the restoration of the national sanctuary, he certainly deserves some credit for seeing this, and more for moving the people to take appropriate action. He was not an Amos or an Isaiah; but must not Amos or Isaiah, in his place, have attempted what he undertook? and would either of them have been more successful?

The style of Haggai is usually regarded as prosaic. Reuss, it will be remembered, pronounces it "colourless." No doubt, it is somewhat tame, if the brilliancy of Isaiah or the polish of the great poet of the Exile be taken as the standard. Yet, Haggai was not without the oriental liking for figures, nor are his prophecies as unrhythmical as they have been represented. In describing his style prominence has sometimes been given to the frequent recurrence of "Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts" and "saith Yahweh," or "Yahweh of Hosts," and it has been interpreted as a sign of "the disappearance of the immediate consciousness of inspiration."* But these expressions are not peculiar to Haggai. In fact, when the instances in which they have been interpolated (6) are deducted, it will be found that he does not use them as many times in his whole book as Jeremiah does in the twenty-third chapter of his prophecies.† It is even more incorrect to represent the use of interrogation as characteristic of this prophet.‡ There are in all six cases. But in the second chapter of Jeremiah, which contains only thirty-seven verses, there are nineteen, or, proportionately, twice as many. There is one expression that may safely be regarded as peculiar to Haggai, namely, "take thought" (lit., "set your hearts"), which occurs no fewer than five times, and, being found in the third as well as the first prophecy, is a

* So Nowack, in the introduction to his commentary on the book of Haggai.

† The exact figures are 14 to 21.

‡ André, 115.

proof that the former is not, as André contends, an interpolation. See pp. 28 *ff*. It seems to be characteristic of Haggai, too, where there is an opportunity, to introduce extended lists of particulars. Such series occur in 1[6. 11] and 2[12. 19].

In the first three cases, however, it is possible that the text has been interpolated. In 1[6] (freely rendered) the arrangement that suggests itself is as follows:

Ye have sown much, but harvested little;
Eaten without satisfaction, drunken without exhilaration, clothed yourselves without comfort;
And the hireling earned,—for a leaky purse.

In 1[11] a similar arrangement is possible:

Yea, I summoned a drought upon the land:
Even upon the highlands, and the grain, and the must, and the oil;
And all that the soil produced.

In 2[12] *bread, or pottage, or wine, or oil* sounds like another list of specifications, but it precedes instead of following the general term *any food*. This fact seems unfavourable to the theory of interpolation. Even more so is the case of 2[19], for here the series appears to be necessary to the expression of the prophet's thought. It is probable, therefore, that he actually wrote:

Is the seed yet in the garner?—
Nor have the vine, and the fig, and the pomegranate, and the olive tree borne:—
From this day will I bless.

If he did, perhaps it is not too much to say that he was apt to express himself in this fashion. Not that he did not sometimes put his thoughts into a more regular form. Take, for example, 1[10] (omitting the evidently superfluous עליכם), which might be freely rendered:

Therefore heaven withheld the rain,
and the earth withheld its fruit.

This is a fairly good specimen of Hebrew parallelism. It is interesting as showing that he had caught the measure, as well as adopted some of the ideas, of the Second Isaiah. It is also important, since it furnishes a warrant for correcting some of the irregularities in his prophecies, when other considerations point in the same direction. Applied to 2[6-9] the metrical principle confirms the following analysis. The words in plain type are accretions:

6. *For thus saith Yahweh of Hosts:*
Yet once *a little while,*
And I will shake heaven and earth,
and the sea, and the dry land;
7. *yea, I will shake all nations;*
And the treasures of all nations shall come,
and I will fill this house with wealth,
saith Yahweh of Hosts:
8. *For mine is the silver, and mine the gold,*
saith Yahweh of Hosts.

9. *Great shall be the wealth of this house,*
the future above the past,
saith Yahweh of Hosts:
And in this place I will grant peace,
*saith Yahweh of Hosts.**

Other illustrations might be cited, but it would probably be difficult, without more or less violence to the text, to reduce the whole book, or even the prophecies, to a poetical form. Still, too much of it is metrical to justify the distinction made by Köhler (31) that, "while the method of presentation preferred by the older prophets was the poetical, that of Haggai, on the other hand, bore an oratorical character." It would be more nearly correct to say that the compiler of the book uses prose, and the prophet himself at first speaks the language of common life, but that, as he proceeds, he adopts to a varying extent poetical forms of thought and expression.

* In every case the ungenuineness of the word or words omitted can be established without reference to the metre. For details, see the comments.

COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHECIES OF HAGGAI.

Most of the prophetical books have proper titles. They are of varying length, that of Jeremiah being the longest and most comprehensive and that of Obadiah, as is fitting, the shortest. The book of Haggai, like those of Ezekiel, Jonah and Zechariah, has none, the opening verse being merely an introduction to the first of a brief series of prophecies of which the two chapters of the work are mainly composed. The contents of these chapters naturally fall into four sections, each of which has prefixed to it the date of the prophecy therein reported. The general subject is the restoration of the temple at Jerusalem. The first subordinate topic is

§ 1. THE MOVEMENT TO REBUILD THE SANCTUARY ($1^{1\text{-}15a}$).

This topic occupies the whole of the first chapter, in its original extent, but the prophet is the speaker only in vv. $^{2\text{-}11}$, the rest of the passage being an account of the effect of his message on those to whom it was delivered. Hence it will be advisable to discuss the chapter under two heads, the first being

a. THE MESSAGE OF THE PROPHET ($1^{1\text{-}11}$).

It begins abruptly with the citation of the adverse opinion among the Jews with reference to the question of rebuilding the sanctuary (v. ^{2}). Haggai argues for the contrary, presenting two reasons (vv. $^{4\text{-}6}$) calculated to appeal strongly to those to whom they were addressed. Taking the validity of these arguments for granted, he proceeds to exhort his people to act in the matter (vv. $^{7\,f.}$); but,

instead of resting his case at this point, to make sure that his exhortation will be heeded he repeats the second of his arguments (vv. [8-11]), giving it a form so direct and positive that it cannot be misunderstood, and so forcible that he who ignores it must take the attitude of defying the Almighty.

1. All the prophecies of Haggai were delivered *in the second year of Darius*. There are two, possibly three, persons, real or imaginary, mentioned by this name (Heb. Dārĕyāwesh; Per. Dârayaya'ush) in the Old Testament. The first is "Darius the Mede," the mythical conqueror who, according to Dn. $6^1/5^{31}$, "received the kingdom" of Babylon after the death of Belshazzar. The third is "Darius the Persian" (Ne. 12^{22}).

In Dn. 9^1 Darius is called "the son of Ahasuerus," that is, Xerxes; but, since Xerxes belongs to a period (485–465 B.C.) considerably later than that of the Persian invasion (539 B.C.), it is impossible that his son, who, moreover, bore the name Artaxerxes, had anything to do with that event. It is probable that the author of Daniel, having but a confused traditional knowledge of the history of the East, and being influenced by earlier predictions (Is. $13^{17 ff.}$ $21^{2 ff.}$ Je. $51^{11 ff. 27 ff.}$) to the effect that the Medes would overthrow Babylon, like the author of Tobit 14^{15} identified the best-known of the Medo-Persian kings with Cyaxares, the destroyer of Nineveh, and then made Darius, who actually took Babylon twice during his reign, a son of this Median ruler and gave him the credit of overthrowing the Babylonian empire. *Cf. EB.*, arts. *Darius; Persia*, 13; Prince, *Daniel*, 53 *ff.* Winckler (*KAT.*[3], 288) thinks that Cambyses is meant. On the older views, see *DB.*, art. *Darius;* Prince, 45.

Winckler (*KAT.*[3], 288) identifies Darius the Persian with Darius Hystaspes. The more common opinion is that Darius Codomannus, the last of the Persian kings, is the one so designated. So Meyer, *EJ.*, 104; *et al.*

The author of Ne. $12^{10 ff.}$ begins with a genealogy of the high priests of the Persian period (vv. [10 f.]), which is followed by a list of the names of the heads of the priestly houses for "the days of Joiakim." *Cf.* vv. [12-21]. Finally he asserts, v. [22], where all reference to the Levites should be omitted, that, in the source from which he drew, there were similar lists for the period of each of the high priests mentioned "until (עד for על) the reign of Darius the Persian." In other words, he makes Nehemiah a contemporary of Eliashib and the king he has in mind a contemporary of Jaddua, three generations later, the date of Darius Codomannus. This conclusion is not affected however one may interpret Ne. 13^{28}, that passage being by a different author. *Cf. JBL.*, xxii, 97 *ff.*

The king to whom reference is here made is Darius Hystaspes. This is clear from Zc. 7^5, where the prophet, who was a contemporary of Haggai, in a message delivered in the fourth year of Darius,

represents the period of affliction as having lasted seventy years; for Darius Hystaspes came to the throne, as has already been described (p. 20), in 521 B.C., so that his fourth year was the sixty-ninth after the destruction of Jerusalem. *Cf.* also Zc. 1^{12}. He is here called simply *the king*, not, as he is by later writers, "king of Persia." *Cf.* Ezr. 1^{1} Dn. 1^{10}. His *second year* corresponded roughly to 520 B.C., and *the sixth month*, according to the Babylonian system, which was adopted by the Jews during the Exile,* to the latter part of August and the first part of September. It was on *the first day* of this month, then called *Elul* (Ne. 6^{15}), when the people were enjoying a holiday (Am. 8^{5} Is. 66^{23}), that *the word of Yahweh came*, lit., *was*.† See also v. ^{3} $2^{1.\ 10.\ 20}$ Zc. 1^{1}, *et pas.* The message came *by*, lit., *by the hand of*,‡ *Haggai the prophet*. Hitherto it has not been clear who was writing. It now appears that it is not Haggai recording his own utterances, but some one else reporting what the prophet said on various occasions. This becomes more evident in the next section, where the same author, presumably, describes the effect of Haggai's preaching. The prophet, it seems, when the book was compiled, had already closed his career. His message was intended primarily for two persons at that time prominent in Jerusalem. The first was *Zerubbabel*. His name, whatever may be its first component, evidently has for its second the Hebrew designation for Babylon. The person so called is described as a *son of Shealtiel*, who, according to 1 Ch. 3^{18}, was the eldest son of the captive king Jehoiachin (2 K. 24^{15} 25^{27}) and *governor of Judah*.

(1) The name Haggai was not borne by any other person mentioned in the Old Testament, but there are many other names of the same class. *Cf.* Ezbai, Amittai, Barzillai, Zakkai, etc. It is commonly interpreted as a derivative, in the sense of *festal*, from חַג, *feast*. So Ew. ^{8} § ^{164}; Ols. § ^{217a}; Ges. § $^{86.\ 2.\ 5}$. It may, however, be a mutilated form of חֲגִיָּה, 1 Ch. 6^{15},—like מַתְּנַי, Ezr. 10^{33}, for מַתַּנְיָה, Gn. 46^{16},—of which there is a feminine חַגִּית. *Cf.* 2 S. 3^{4}. The Massoretic vocalisation is supported by Gr. Ἀγγαῖος and Lat. Haggæus or Aggæus.

* *Cf. DB.*, art. *Time; EB.*, art. *Year;* Benzinger, *Arch.*, 199 *f.*

† This form of expression is frequent in the prophecies of Jeremiah and later writings. See especially the book of Ezekiel, where it occurs about fifty times.

‡ This, also, is a late idiom, common from the Exile onward. *Cf.* Ju. 3^{4} 1 K. 12^{15} Je. 37^{2}, *et pas.;* also C. and HB., *Hex.*, i, 219a.

(α) Of the various etymologies for Zerubbabel thus far suggested the most attractive is that which makes it a Hebrew modification of Zer-babili, ***seed of Babylon***, a name that actually occurs in inscriptions of the time of Darius. *Cf.* Pinches, OT., 425. For others, *cf. DB.*, art. *Zerubbabel;* Köhler, 11 *f.* The Hebrew vocalisation is explained by van Hoonacker (*PP.*), who translates it "Crush Babylon" (זְרֻב בָּבֶל) as an instance of paronomasia, intended to express at the same time "the hopes that his compatriots based upon the scion of the Davidic dynasty and the resentment that they cherished against Babylon."

(β) Mt. 1^{12} makes Zerubbabel the son of Shealtiel, but according to 1 Ch. 3^{19}, he was the son of Pedaiah, a younger brother of Shealtiel. A deal of ingenuity has been expended in trying to harmonise these conflicting genealogies. Thus, Aben Ezra explains that Zerubbabel was reared by his uncle, and therefore called the son of Shealtiel. So Dru., *et al.* Ki. prefers to think that Pedaiah was a son, not a brother, of Shealtiel, and that Zerubbabel was called the son of his grandfather because the latter was held in higher honour than the father. So Hd., *et al.* Some Christian exegetes have undertaken to harmonise this passage and 1 Ch. 3^{19}, not only with each other, but with Lu. 3^{27}, where Shealtiel is the son, not of Jeconiah, but of Neri, a descendant of David through the line of Nathan. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 3^{5}. Köh. on 2^{23} does it as follows: Jeconiah, as a result of the curse pronounced upon him by Jeremiah (22^{30}), had no grandsons, but his son Assir had a daughter who, in accordance with the law for such cases (Nu. $36^{8 f.}$), married Neri and bore him, first Shealtiel, who became the heir of Assir, and was reckoned his son, then six others, among them Pedaiah. Next, Shealtiel died, leaving a widow but no children; whereupon his brother Pedaiah took his wife and begot Zerubbabel, who, in accordance with the law of levirate (Dt. $25^{5 ff.}$), was the legal son and heir of the deceased. Thus Zerubbabel is made to appear the son of both Shealtiel and Pedaiah, the grandson of Neri, and a remoter descendant of Jeconiah. The flaw in this ingenious scheme is that it is based on a mistaken interpretation of a corrupt passage. It falls to pieces at once when אסיר in 1 Ch. 3^{19} is properly rendered, not as a proper name, but as an adjective used adverbially in the sense of ***when imprisoned***. *Cf.* Ges. § 118. 5 (a). It is therefore necessary to recognise in Shealtiel a son of Jeconiah, and abandon the attempt to make the Chronicler agree with Luke. The discrepancy between the Chronicler and Haggai, however, can be removed by substituting Shealtiel for Pedaiah, as 𝔊 does, in 1 Ch. 3^{19}; which, moreover, makes the Chronicler consistent with himself. *Cf.* Ezr. 3^{2} 5^{2} Ne. 12^{1}.

The natural inference is that Zerubbabel was a prince of the house of David who had not only been released from captivity, but, in accordance with the practice of the Persian kings, appointed to administer the affairs of his conquered country under the higher official called in Ezr. 5^{3} "the governor beyond the River." How long he had occupied this position when Haggai began to prophesy, there seems to be no means of discovering.* With him was

* For an apocryphal account of his selection for it, see 1 Esd. $4^{13 ff.}$.

associated *Joshua,** *son of Jehosadak*. The father, according to 1 Ch. $5^{40}/6^{14}$, was a son of Seraiah, the chief priest who was put to death by Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah after the destruction of Jerusalem. *Cf.* 2 K. $25^{18\,ff.}$ Je. $52^{24\,ff.}$. Ezra the scribe, according to Ezr. 7^{1}, was his brother. Jehosadak, as well as Ezra, was carried into captivity to Babylon (1 Ch. $5^{41}/6^{15}$), where Joshua seems to have been born and reared. Kosters (*WI.*, 41 *f.*) questions whether he was the grandson of Seraiah, and therefore whether he was ever in Babylonia. The Chronicler, he says, holding the mistaken opinion that there had been a continuous line of high priests from the Exodus to his own time, took for granted that Joshua was a lineal descendant of Seraiah and used Jehosadak as a link to connect them. This may be true, but there are some considerations that make it possible to believe the contrary. (1) Although the Jews had no high priest, in the sense in which the term is used in the Hexateuch, before the Exile, such passages as 2 K. 11^{18}, as well as 25^{18}, show that they had a chief over their priests, and other passages, like 1 S. 14^{3}, prove that the office regularly descended from father to son. *Cf. EB.*, art. *Priest*, 5; Benzinger, *Arch.*, 413 *f.* (2) Since the high-priesthood proper was but an extension of this hereditary office, it may be taken for granted, unless there is proof to the contrary, that the former was the heritage of the family that had enjoyed the latter. (3) The importance of the succession was such that there must have been records with reference to it from which the Chronicler was able to obtain reliable information. In Ne. 12^{23} a source of this sort is cited. Fortunately, it is not necessary to decide the question of Joshua's pedigree, the important thing being that he was *the high priest* when Haggai prophesied, and that this is perhaps the oldest instance of the use of the title in the Old Testament.†

2. The prophet, after a formal announcement, *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts*, introduces the subject of his discourse by citing the prevalent opinion with reference to it. The very first words are

* In Ezra and Nehemiah, Jeshua, whence the Greek Ἰησοῦς and the English Jesus.

† It occurs in Lv. 21^{10} Nu. $35^{25.\,28}$ Jos. 20^{6} (all P.); as a gloss in 2 K. $12^{11/10}$ $22^{4.\,8}$ 23^{4}; and in 2 Ch. 34^{9} Ne. $3^{1.\,20}$ 13^{28}. In the books of Chronicles and Ezra its place is supplied by כהן הראש, *the chief priest*, or its equivalent. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 27^{5} 2 Ch. 19^{11} $24^{6.\,11}$ 26^{20} 31^{10} Ezr. 7^{5}; also 2 K. 25^{18} = Je. 52^{24}.

ominous, for here, as in Is. 8^6 and often elsewhere, the phrase *this people* betrays impatience and disapproval.* The reason for Yahweh's displeasure is that the people *say*, have said and are still saying, *The time hath not come for the house of Yahweh to be built*, that is, rebuilt. At first sight this objection would seem to mean that those who made it were waiting for the expiration of the seventy years of Jeremiah's prophecy. *Cf.* Je. 25^{11}. The answer given to it shows that it was dictated by selfishness, which manifested itself also in absorption in comparatively trivial personal affairs to the neglect of the larger issues that ought to interest all the members of the community. Nor did they simply neglect the ruined house. The words cited breathe resistance to an appeal in favour of rebuilding it. It is probable that the proposal had been made or strongly supported by Haggai himself, and that therefore the prophecy here recorded was not the first to which he gave utterance.—**3.** The tone of v. [2] leads the reader to expect an indignant and immediate reply to the excuse given. The present text first repeats the announcement of v. [1], as if the prophet, having made the statement of v. [2], did not proceed until he had received further instructions. Any such supposition, however, so weakens the force of the prophet's message that it is better to omit this verse altogether. See the textual notes.—**4.** Thus it appears that v. [2] was originally immediately followed by the question, *Is it a time for you yourselves to dwell in ceiled houses, while this house is desolate?* The ceiled, or panelled, houses elsewhere mentioned were finished in cedar. The same wood was used in the first temple (1 K. 6^9); also in the dwellings of the rich in the time of Jeremiah. *Cf.* Je. 22^{14}. It is hardly possible that this or any other costly wood was found in many of the houses of those whom Haggai was addressing;—most of them must have been miserably poor;—but they all had roofs over their heads, while Yahweh as yet had no habitation. The temple had now been desolate about sixty-seven years, and it was nineteen years since Cyrus had released the Jews from captivity.—**5.** The people had now for some

* The words are rendered additionally forcible by being placed in a semi-independent relation before the verb, which might be indicated by the rendering, *This people, they say*. *Cf.* Ges. § 143.

time been suffering, how and to what extent will appear later. Perhaps they had made this an excuse for not rebuilding the temple. It had not occurred to them that their misfortunes might be due to their neglect of Yahweh. Haggai was decidedly of this opinion. He therefore follows the question of the preceding verse with the exhortation, *take thought on your ways*. This, in view of the use of the same expression in v. [7], seems a better rendering than that of Wellhausen, *Consider how ye have fared*. *Cf.* also $2^{15.\,18}$.—**6.** The prophet might next have reminded his people how often and how widely they had departed from the path of loyalty and righteousness. Perhaps he did so in the original discourse, and these details have been omitted. In any case, they do not appear in his book, but here, taking them for granted, he proceeds to recite some of the results of, or, as he would have put it, the penalties for, their conduct, and especially for their neglect of the sanctuary. *Ye have sowed much*, he says, *and harvested little*. He is reminding them of the repeated failure of their crops. This is in itself a great calamity. It is therefore not probable that, in the details which follow, the prophet intends to convey the idea sometimes attributed to him (Köh.), that food, drink and clothing were deprived of their natural properties to increase the suffering from scarcity. He means simply that so small were the returns from the soil, when those who lived from it ate, there was *not enough* to still their hunger; when they drank wine, they could never drink their *fill*, lit., *to drunkenness* (Gn. 43^{34}); and when they dressed themselves, their clothing was so scanty that *none* of them *was warm*. *Cf.* v. [9] 2^{16}. This was the condition of the husbandman. That of the labourer was equally, if not more, wretched; for *he who wrought for wages earned—for a leaky purse;* that is to say, when he could secure employment, which, according to Zc. 8^{10}, was rare, his pay was so small, in comparison with the prices he had to pay for the necessities of life, that it seemed to him as if his wages had disappeared through holes in his purse as soon as he had received them.

There is another interpretation that deserves mention, if for no other reason on account of its ingenuity. It is that of André. He takes צרור in the sense of *little stone* and renders the clause in question, *the hireling wrought for a little pierced stone*. This he interprets as an allusion to a custom that ex-

isted in Babylon, where, he says, one who had bought a slave at the market hung his seal about the neck of the newly acquired chattel to indicate that he or she was his property. He says that as "put in irons" is equivalent to "imprison," so "a pierced pebble" means nothing more nor less than "slavery." Hence to work for a pierced pebble is in the end, in spite of one's work, to become a slave. The following are some of the objections to this interpretation: (1) The usual meaning of צרור is *bag* or *purse*. *Cf.* Jb. 14[17] Gn. 42[35]. (2) If the prophet had wished to express the idea attributed to him by André, he would probably have used חותם, the proper word for *seal*. *Cf.* 2[23] Gn. 38[18] Ct. 8[6]. (3) Although אֶל is used in the sense of *for the sake of* (1 K. 19[3]), the more natural interpretation is that it denotes destination after a pregnant verb. *Cf.* Gn. 19[27].

7. The representation of the ills the Jews had suffered and were suffering as chastisement for their shortcomings was calculated to move them to ask what they could do to secure the favour of Yahweh and different treatment from his hands. Haggai next answers this question; and first, if the text is correct, in general terms, by repeating the exhortation of v. [5], *Take thought on your ways;* by which he means that, as they have offended, so they can appease, their God by their behaviour. He does not, however, stop with this general suggestion. There is one thing above all others that they ought to have done, but have left undone. Their first duty is to make good this omission. *Go up*, he says, speaking for Yahweh, *into the mountains and cut timber, and build the house.* It is not clear to what mountains* he refers. The hills both of Judah and Ephraim seem to have been well wooded in ancient times. *Cf.* the name Kirjath-jearim (Jos. 9[17]; also Jos. 17[14 ff.] 1 S. 14[25 ff.]). Carmel was noted for its forests. *Cf.* Mi. 7[14] Ct. 7[5]. It is possible that the prophet had in mind Lebanon, whence the timber for the first temple was procured. *Cf.* 1 K. 5[15 ff.]/5[ff.]. The author of Ezr. 3[7] evidently thought so, since he says, apparently on the basis of this passage, that the Jews, when they first attempted to rebuild the sanctuary, employed "the Sidonians and the Tyrians to bring cedars from Lebanon to the sea," and thus "to Joppa."† Still it is doubtful if, under the circumstances, Haggai would have directed his people to seek materials for the new structure at so

* The noun is singular in the original, but in such a case it frequently means a hilly or mountainous region. *Cf.* Dt. 1[7] Is. 11[9].

† On the authenticity of this passage, see pp. 9 *f.*

great a distance. It would have involved too much time and expense and attracted too much attention. Nothing is said of stone, because there was plenty of this material in the ruins of the city, if not in those of the former temple. The motive for the action required is a double one; first, *that I may take pleasure in it.** The second clause may be rendered, as it is by the great Versions, *that I may be glorified*, namely, by the worship of the sanctuary, or, better, *that I may glorify myself*, *i. e.*, by a display of glory inaugurate the Messianic era. So Köh., We., Now., Marti, *et al.* The prophet makes no reference to the political situation, but, as has been shown elsewhere, his proposal synchronises too closely with the disturbance in the East at the beginning of the reign of Darius to permit one to doubt that he intended to take advantage of it to attain the object he had at heart.—**9.** In presenting to the Jews the prospect of pleasing Yahweh the prophet was appealing to a powerful motive, the universal desire for life and happiness, peculiarly prominent in Deuteronomy. He does not, however, rely on this alone, but again recalls their past experience to show what are the consequences of disregarding the divine will. *Ye have looked for much*, he makes Yahweh say, *and lo, it became*, or *had become, little*. *Cf.* 2^{16}. Nor was this all, for he adds, *as ye brought* this little *home, I blew upon it.* At first thought it seems as if the prophet had in mind a sudden and powerful gust of wind, "a blast of the breath" of the Almighty (Ps. $18^{16/15}$), but perhaps he alludes to the superstition still current in the East that the breath may produce a magical effect upon anything toward which it is directed.† It is not, however, necessary, with Wellhausen and others, to suppose that Haggai thought of Yahweh as actually using magic. The expression used is in effect a simile illustrating the surprising rapidity with which the scanty harvest disappeared. See the "leaky purse" of v. ^{6}. *Wherefore?* asks Yahweh, and answers his own question, for the first time expressly connecting the misfortunes described with the neglect of the temple: *Because of my*

* The rendering, *I will be gracious in it*, is less defensible, since, if the prophet had intended to express this thought, he would not have omitted the object *you*.

† "It is in the highest degree disagreeable to Moslems if any one whistles over a threshing-floor heaped with grain. Then comes the devil, they say, in the night and takes a part of the harvest."—L. Bauer, in *Mittheilungen u. Nachrichten des deutschen Palæstina-Vereins*, 1899, 9.

house, that is desolate, or *Because my house is desolate*. Not that this state of things would be unpardonable under any circumstances. It is, however, to use the words of the text, *while ye make haste each about his own home*. The complaint is the same as in v. 4, but here it seems to be directed against a considerable number of persons who, perhaps because they had recently arrived in Jerusalem, were engaged in providing themselves with dwellings.—**10.** *Therefore*—because his people were more eager to get themselves well housed than to provide him with a worthy abode—Yahweh set in motion the secondary causes that produced the condition just described. *Heaven* at his command *withheld rain*. The text has *dew*, but there are good reasons for believing that this is a copyist's error. One of them is that, although there are several passages in which the dew is described as refreshing the earth and vegetation (Dt. 33^{28}. Gn. $27^{28, 39}$), there is no other in which the suspension of this phenomenon alone is represented as producing a drought. On the other hand, the production of a drought by withholding rain is repeatedly threatened or recorded. *Cf.* Dt. 11^{17} 1 K. 8^{35}, but especially Am. 4^{7}.* If in this case it was the rain that was withheld in great measure, it is not strange that *the earth withheld its produce*. The rainfall of Palestine has always been irregular and unreliable. It is almost entirely confined to the months from November to April inclusive, but it varies greatly from year to year in amount as well as in its distribution through the rainy season. The lowest figures for the years from 1861 to 1880, for example, were 13.39 inches, and the highest 32.21 inches, the average being 23.32 inches.† Whenever the amount threatens to fall below 25 inches the people become apprehensive; if it falls below 20 inches, they expect to suffer; and if, as was the case in 1864–66, there is a shortage for two or three years in succession, many of them are forced, like the patriarch, to migrate or starve. —**11.** The rainfall varies, also, for different parts of the country, sometimes to the extent of several inches. Amos, in the passage above cited, tells of cases in which it rained upon one city and not

* For other reasons for the emendation proposed, see the critical notes.

† *DB.*, art. *Rain*; where, however, the average rainfall for the period is incorrectly given as "about 20 inches."

at all upon another, or even upon one of two adjoining fields. The *drought** to which Haggai here refers was summoned *upon the earth.* That is, as in the preceding verse, the ground. The phrase, *even upon the mountains*, which follows, might be interpreted as meaning the more elevated parts of the country, where ordinarily the rainfall is heaviest;† but it is probably here, as in Ez. 33[28], a more exact designation for the Holy Land as a whole. On its genuineness, see the critical notes. *The grain, the must*‡ *and the oil* were then, as they still are, the principal crops. *Cf.* Dt. 11[14] 18[4], etc. The drought not only affected these but *all that the soil produced*, thus robbing *men and cattle* of *all the labour of their hands*, the results that are desired and expected from tilling and sowing the ground and tending the orchards and vineyards.§

1. בשׁנת שתים] For בשׁנה השׁנית. *Cf.* Gn. 47[18]; Nrd. § 942. 3 a.—ביום אחד] The word יום, for which 𝔊 𝔖 have no equivalent, is probably a later addition. *Cf.* 2[1. 10. 20], where it is omitted. The later idiom occurs also in v. [15]. *Cf.* Ges. § 134. 4 R.—הנביא] 𝔊 adds λέγων· Εἰπὸν. Sm. accordingly inserts לאמר אמר. So also We., Now., Marti. Wrongly, for these reasons: (1) This reading is not supported by the other great Vrss. (2) The added words, as Bu. (*ZAW.*, 1906, 7 *ff.*) has shown, are unsuitable with ביד, which requires that the agent be immediately followed, as in the present text, by אל with the names or titles of the persons for whom the message is intended. Otherwise the agent is made to address himself, *saying, say*, etc. This, to be sure, is what he does in 2[1]; but only because in that passage ביד has been substituted for אל to bring it into harmony with this one. If אל be restored, the two passages will represent two ways of describing the transmission of a divinely inspired message; in one of which Yahweh speaks *by* or *through* the prophet *to* others (1[1]), while in the other he says *to* the former what he wishes him to communicate to the latter (2[1]). The adoption of 𝔊's reading in this case would require the change of ביד to אל; but if this change were made it would be impossible to explain how ביד, which is an error for אל in 2[10] as well as in 2[1], found its way into either of these passages. It seems nec-

* The prophet here indulges in paronomasia. The offence consisted in permitting the house of Yahweh to lie חָרֵב (*ḥarebh*), the penalty is חֹרֶב (*ḥorebh*). It is as if one said in English, Because the temple was a *ruin*, the land was denied *rain*.

† *ZDPV.*, xxxii, 80 *ff.*

‡ On the distinction between must and wine, see Mi. 6[15]. The former is only potentially intoxicating or injurious. *Cf.* Ju. 9[13] Ho. 4[11], and, on the latter passage, Marti.

§ That the labour is the labour of the cattle as well as their owners appears from the fact that the word כף (*kaph*) means not only the human palm but the sole of the foot of a man or an animal.

essary, therefore, to reject the emendation proposed.—וזרבבל] Written also, and frequently, זרובבל.—פחת] Assy. *paḫatu*, or more fully, *bel paḫati, lord of a district.* 𝔊, here and in vv. [12. 14] 2[10. 21], has ἐκ φυλῆς, the translators apparently taking פחת for the equivalent of, or an abbreviation for, ממשפחת. So 𝔖ᴴ.—**2.** אמר] Lit., *hath said*, but, since the message is now first delivered, it may properly be rendered *saith.* *Cf.* Ges. § [106. 2].—לא עת בא עת וגו'] The text as it stands is not unintelligible. It would naturally be rendered, *It is not a time to come, the time, etc.* So Marck, Köh., Klo. Many, however, regard this as unnatural. The emendations suggested are of three classes. In one the consonants of the present text are retained but the vocalisation changed. Thus, some rd., with AV., בָּא for בא, *i. e., The time is not come, the time, etc.* So Dru., Hd. Others change עֵת־בֹּא to עַתָּ בא, producing, *Not now is the time come, etc.* So Hi., We., Now., Marti. Neither of these suggestions can be pronounced indefensible. In the former, however, if the first עת were the subject of בא, it would naturally have the article, as in Ez. 7[7. 12], while in the latter עַתָּה=עַתָּ seems superfluous. A second method of improving the text involves consonantal changes. Thus, Oort reads לא עוד בָּא עת וגו', *The time is not yet come, etc.*, and André לא עֵת־בָּא את וגו', the latter simply eliminating the second עת; but for *not yet* Haggai uses עד לא (2[19]), and as for André's device, it does not touch the real difficulty. The objections noted do not lie against a third method, the omission of the first עת and the substitution of בָּא for בֹּא. The result is a simple, straightforward text meaning, *The time is not come, etc.*, which, moreover, has the support of the Vrss. The case, then, is apparently one of dittog. occasioned by the resemblance between בא and בית.—בית יהוה] A case of attraction. For the regular construction, see Gn. 29[7]; Kö. § [414 o].—**3.** Hi. explains this verse as a device to remedy the clumsiness of the prophet in citing (v. [2]) the words of the people instead of those of the prophet. Bu. replies, and justly, that the clumsiness is all in this verse, which he therefore rejects as ungenuine. *Cf. ZAW.*, 1906, 10. *Contra*, Hi., Now., Marti, And. It was doubtless inserted by some one who, like Ki., interpreted what follows as a message to the people as distinguished from their leaders. The phraseology (ביד) was borrowed from v. [1].—**4.** אתם] Emphatic. *Cf.* Gn. 27[34] Zc. 7[5]; Ges. § [135. 2 (c)]. Houb. rd. אַתָּה.—בתיכם] So 𝔊ᴮ 𝔖; but 𝔊ᴬQ 𝔗 𝔙 𝔄 appear to have had בתים. The adoption of the latter reading makes an explanation of the omission of the article before the adj. following unnecessary. For the opposite view, *cf.* Ges. § [118. 5 (b)]; Kö. § [412 l].—הבית הזה] 𝔊ᴮ, οἶκος ὑμῶν, but 𝔐 is supported by 𝔊ᴷᴬQᴸ 𝔙 𝔖. On the construction with ו, *cf.* Ges. § [141. 2 (e)].—**5.** לבבכם] For לבביכם. *Cf.* Ges. § [124. 2 (c)].—**6.** והבא] Inf. abs. in continuation of the finite construction. *Cf.* Ges. § [113. 4 (a)].—מעט] In pause, with a lighter distinctive, Ges. § [29. 4].—לשבעה] On this and the following fem. inf., *cf.* Ges. § [45. 1 (b)]; Bö. § [990. 2 B].—לחם] Many mss. and

edd. rd. לחום.—לו] Indef. after an impersonal vb. *Cf.* 1 K. 1^{1}; Ges. § $^{144.\,2}$; Kö. § $^{324\,e}$.—מִשְׂתַּכֵּר] Kenn. 150 rd. ישתכר. So And., Bu. The use of the prtc. in 𝔖 𝔗 favours 𝔐.—**7.** This verse has received special attention from recent critics. We., who is followed by Now., Marti, om. the latter half of it. The reason given is that the expression used is not applicable except to past action or experience; but in $2^{15.\,18}$ practically the same expression is clearly used, first of the past and then of the future, just as, on the supposition that this verse is genuine, it is in this section. It has also been proposed to relieve the difficulty with the present text by rearranging it. Thus, Van H. transposes vv. ^{7} and ^{8}, while Bu. inserts the latter after v. ^{4}. The objection to these devices is that they both leave v. ^{7} meaningless and indefensible. On the other hand, if the present arrangement is preserved, the relation of vv. $^{7\,f.}$ to their context will furnish a striking parallel to that of vv. $^{24\,f.}$ of Am. 5 to theirs.—**8.** עלו] 𝔊$^{Nc.\,bAQ}$, *ἀνάβητε ἐπὶ* = עלו על, the reading of Kenn. 1; yet not necessarily, since *ἐπί*, like *εἰς*, in 𝔊 sometimes represents the acc. *Cf.* Ex. 17^{10} Dt. 3^{27}.—והבאתם] 𝔊 *καὶ κόψατε* (א, *κόψετε*); 𝔏, *et cædite* = וּבְרָאתם. 𝔊^{L} adds *καὶ οἴσατε* making וכראתם והבאתם, a reading which is favoured by Bu., but should be explained as one of the numerous cases in 𝔊 in which a second rendering based on 𝔐 has been added to the original translation. This original rendering, on the other hand, since it is easier to mistake בראתם for הבאתם than הבאתם for בראתם, probably reproduces the genuine Hebrew text. *Cf.* Jos. 17^{15}.—וארצֶה] Bö., § $^{380.\,1\,e}$, rd. וארצָה.—ואכבד] Qr. ואכבדה. Kt. is explained by the א following. *Cf.* Zc. 1^{8}; Bö. § $^{380\,g}$. The Jews saw in the omission of the ה (5) a reminder that, as Ra. puts it, "there are five things that were in the first sanctuary, but not in the second, viz., the ark, urim and tummim, the fire, the shekinah, and the Holy Spirit." Houb. would supply בו.—אמר] The first of three cases in the book in which this word is used instead of נאם. *Cf.* $2^{7.\,9}$. There are only three more in Zc. 1–8, 1^{3} 7^{13} 8^{14}. In Mal., on the other hand, it is so frequent (22 t.) as compared with נאם (once), that it may be reckoned one of the prominent characteristics of that book. Now, it can be shown that in $2^{7.\,9}$ the clauses in which this word is used are interpolations. It seems fair, therefore, to conclude that the same is true in this case, unless אמר is here simply a mistake for נאם. —**9.** פנה] The recurrence of the inf. abs. does not necessarily indicate an immediate connection between this verse and v. ^{6}, since this form of the vb. may also begin a new paragraph. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{113.\,4\,(b)\,(e)}$. Houbigant rd. פנת.—והנה] 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 rd. as if the original had been והיה (𝔊^{A}, והיו), and this reading is said to be required if the ל following be retained in the text. So Dru., We., Now., Marti, Kit. It is clear, however, from Gn. 18^{9} that הנה can properly be employed in place of the vb. even before a preposition. *Cf.* also 𝔙; Ges. § $^{147.\,2}$.—והבאתם] Note the tense. The pf. with ו is often used in the course of a narrative to in-

troduce a customary or repeated action. *Cf.* 1 S. 1^{3}. When, as in this case, there are two such verbs, the first may be subordinate to the second, denoting an act done while another was in progress. *Cf.* 1 S. 27^{9}, but especially Am. $7^{2.4 ff.}$; Ges. § 112. 4 (d). So Hi., Ew.; *contra*, Köh., We., Now.—יען מה 𝔊, διὰ τοῦτο; an error, but in the right direction. The vocalisation of מֶה is best explained, not as due to the preceding prep., Köh., or, more specifically, to dissimilation, Kö., i, § 19. 2 b. γ, but to the distance of the word from the principal accent. *Cf.* Ges. § 37. 1 (c). For clearer cases of dissimilation, *cf.* Gn. 4^{10} Zc. 7^{3}.—צבאות] Om. 𝔖.—יען ביתי] A construction chosen for the sake of emphasising the subj. The introduction of הוא after the relative further enhances the desired effect. *Cf.* Kö. § 60; Dr. § 199.—רָצִים] לצים with ב (Marti) is less, and חֲרֵדִים (Che.) no more, expressive.—**10.** על כן עליכם] So 𝔐; but 𝔖 om. על כן, 𝔊 𝔏 עליכם. The last is evidently the original reading, על כן being natural and necessary, while עליכם, whether rendered *over you* or *on your account*, is superfluous. The latter's position indicates that it is either an imperfect dittog., We., or a gloss on the conj. 𝔗 expands it into בדיל חוביכון, *on account of your sins*.—שמים] Rd., with Kenn. 150 and 𝔊, השמים. *Cf.* הארץ.—מטל The text has its defenders, some treating מ as partitive (Ew., And.), others as privative, de D., Köh., Now.; but the later authorities mostly incline to emend it. The readings suggested, הטל, We., and, as in Zc. 8^{12}, טלם Bu., Now., Marti, are grammatically defensible, but there is no positive evidence for either of them. A better one was long ago suggested by Dru., viz., מטר, *rain*, which has the support of 𝔗, needs neither art. nor sf. and, moreover, suits the Hebrew way of thinking. *V.* Com.—**11.** חרב] 𝔊 ῥομφαίαν; 𝔏, *gladium;* a mistake so natural that it has no critical significance.—ועל ההרים] Of doubtful genuineness. Om. Kenn. 150 and a few Gr. curs. 𝔏. *V.* Com.—אשר] Rd., with 30 mss., 𝔊ᴸ 𝔖 𝔗, כל אשר. So We., Now., Marti. —כפים] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖, כפיהם. So Bu., Now., Marti.—Bu. finds the conclusion of this prophecy abrupt. He concludes, therefore, that it must originally have been supplemented by another exhortation to rebuild the temple and, in addition, a corresponding promise. Of the latter he thinks v. ^{13b} a fragment.

b. THE RESPONSE OF THE PEOPLE (I^{12-15a}).

The leaders, Zerubbabel and Joshua, and all the people, being impressed by Haggai's message and especially assured of Yahweh's assistance in any effort they may make, are encouraged to begin work; which they do within a few days of the date of the prophet's first recorded appearance.

12. ***Then hearkened,*** listened with attention, interest and submission, *Zerubbabel . . . and Joshua.* There has been no further reference to them since they were introduced in v. [1], the prophet's whole discourse having been directed over their heads to the people. Perhaps these leaders had already been won for the project of rebuilding the temple before Haggai appealed to the people. Indeed, it is not impossible that they originated it, the prophet acting as their ally and mouthpiece in securing for it popular approval and necessary assistance. However that may be, *all the rest of the people* now recognised *the voice of Yahweh their God* in *the words of Haggai.* Kosters, seeing in *the rest* the remnant of the population left in the land by Nebuchadrezzar "to be vinedressers and husbandmen," uses this passage to prove that no great number had at the time returned from captivity. It is more natural, however, to suppose that the writer here and in 2[2] has in mind the people as distinguished from the leaders just mentioned. If he thinks of them as a remnant, it is because they, the actual inhabitants of the country, without reference to the question whether they have ever been in Babylonia or not, are few in number compared with the earlier population. In either case the same persons are meant who in v. [14] are called *the people,* and in 2[4] *the people of the land.* The *voice* here takes the place of the more common *word* of Yahweh. Both are distinguished from the words of the prophets, who, although they claimed to be moved by the divine Spirit, are careful not to make Yahweh responsible for the details of their messages. *Cf.* Je. 1[1 f.].* In this case the people listened and *feared before Yahweh,* took a reverential attitude toward him, the first step in a new experience.—**13.** Haggai's vivid review of the situation in Judah, and his insistence that it was the fault of the people themselves that they were not more prosperous, naturally disposed them to do something; but there were obstacles, of which, as one may infer from 2[7 ff.], the most serious was their poverty. This being the case, one would expect that the next thing would be a note of encouragement. It is forthcoming, but whether this verse belongs to the original book, or was supplied by a reader who felt that something had been omitted, is disputed. There is room for two opin-

* In Am. 8[11] the pl. *words* is a mistake for the sg. *Cf.* v. [12] and Vrss.

ions. In the first place, Haggai is here called, not "the prophet," as in every previous case in which his name has been mentioned (vv.[1.3.12]), but *the messenger* (*angel*) *of Yahweh*. This is not a rare title. In fact, it is quite common, especially in the earlier portions of the Old Testament. *Cf.* Gn. 16[7], *et pas.* Regularly, however, like the rarer "messenger of God," it denotes, as may be learned from Is. 63[9], the manifestation of the personal presence of the Deity. It is therefore often but a paraphrase of one of the divine names.* The same interpretation must be given to "my messenger" and "his messenger," except in one instance (Is. 42[19]), where "my messenger" evidently means Israel as a prophetic people. This exception is interesting as indicating that as early as the Exile, if not before it, the title "messenger of Yahweh" had acquired a human, as well as a divine, connotation, while Mal. 2[7] furnishes a concrete example of this broader usage, for there the priest is expressly called "the messenger of Yahweh of Hosts." It must therefore be admitted that the compiler of the prophecies of Haggai might, without exciting comment, have called the prophet *the messenger of Yahweh*. Still, it is not probable that, having adopted the title heretofore used, he would, without apparent reason, have employed another so strikingly different. It seems safe, therefore, to conclude that the whole verse is an interpolation.†—**14.** The special message brought by the prophet had the desired effect. *Yahweh* thereby *aroused*—the word is the same that is used in the cases of Cyrus and others (Is. 42[1] Je. 50[9] Ezr. 1[15]), whom Yahweh is represented as having chosen to execute his purposes—*the spirit of Zerubbabel*, who is here again called *governor* to emphasise the importance to the Jews of having the enthusiastic support of the civil head of the community in their enterprise. For the same reason *Joshua* is given his title, *the high priest*, in this connection. *The people* also were stirred, all of them, so that *they came* with their leaders *and did work*, gave effect to their zeal in service, *on the house of Yahweh*.‡ The idiom here em-

* *Cf.* Zc. 12[8]; Davidson, *Theol.*, 296 *ff.*; Piepenbring, *Theol.*, 144 *ff.*

† Jer. notes the fact that some had interpreted this passage as teaching that Haggai was an angel, but he himself interprets the title given to him as a synonym for "prophet."

‡ Calvin finds in this passage support for his doctrine of the will. God, he says, did not merely confirm a free volition, but produced the "willing mind" among the people.

ployed does not imply that the temple was already partly built, or even that the foundations had been laid. The preposition rendered *on* is the same that is found in Zc. 6^{15}, where the English version has *in*. This is the literal meaning, but the particle is frequently used in constructions in which but a part of the object is affected,* and both of these are constructions of this sort. Hence the passage in Zechariah may be rendered, "they shall build on the temple," or, more freely, "they shall take part in the building of the temple"; while this one may be translated as above or paraphrased so that it will more clearly include such operations as the removal of debris from the site or the accumulation of the required materials.† Indeed, in view of the fact that a date immediately follows, it would seem allowable to suppose that the writer intended to say that they *began work on the house* on the day specified.—**15.** The date given is *the twenty-fourth day of the month*. It was therefore only twenty-three days after Haggai's exhortation when the people responded to his summons; which was perhaps as early as they could have been expected to commence operations. For a fuller discussion of the date, see the textual notes.

12. Baer makes no break, but there is ms. authority for beginning here a new section. *Cf.* Gins., *Int.*, 17.—וישמע] Köh. prefers וישמח, but it would anticipate v. ^{14}. On the construction with ב, *cf.* Ges. §$^{119\ (b)\ (2)}$.—שלתיאל] Here and in v. ^{14} 2^{2} some mss. have the full form.—Add, with 𝔊 𝔏, the title פחת יהודה, as elsewhere, except in 2^{23}, where it would not be in place. *Cf.* vv. $^{1.\ 14}$ $2^{2.\ 21}$.—ועל] 𝔖 𝔗 have ל, 𝔊 𝔙 the same construction as for ב. The original must have been ואל, for which ועל is a frequent mistake of copyists in the later books, and one easily made after writing it eight times in v. ^{11}. *Cf.* 2 K. 18^{27} Is. 36^{12}.—כאשר] So 𝔊 𝔏 𝔙 𝔗, while 𝔖 omits the prep. So also 10 Heb. mss. *Cf.* 2 K. 19^{4}. This passage is noted in the Mas. as one of twelve in which כאשר = אשר; which means that it is a rare and perhaps a corrupt reading.—אלהיהם] Hi., We., Marti rd. אליהם; but the recurrence of Yahweh seems to require the repetition of אלהיהם. *Cf.* Ne. 9^{3}. If, therefore, as Now. claims, אליהם is even more essential, it follows that the original must have been אלהיהם אליהם, which is actually found in 5 mss. and reproduced in the Vrss. *Cf.* Je. 43^{1}. The omission of אליהם is easily explained as a case of haplog.—**13.** This verse, whose genuineness seems to have been seriously ques-

* *BDB.*, art. ב, I, 2, b.

† So Ki., Dru., Grotius, Köh., We.

tioned first by Böh. (*ZAW.*, 1887, 215 *f.*), is now generally treated as an interpolation. Kö. (*Einl.*, 363), however, defends it, and Bu. (*ZAW.*, 1906, 13), as already noted, recognises in v.^{b} a fragment of the lost (?) conclusion of vv. $^{1-11}$. *Cf.* note on v. ^{11}. The reasons for the prevailing opinion are: (1) It disturbs, without reinforcing, the narrative. (2) It is not in the manner of the compiler of the book. See מלאך יהוה for הנביא 1$^{1.\,12}$ 2$^{1.\,10.\,20}$ (𝔊) and לעם for אל העם 1^{1} 2^{2}, etc. (3) The words attributed to Yahweh seem inconsistent with the situation. *Cf.* Com. —במלאכות יהוה] Om. 𝔊$^{AQmg.}$ 𝔖^{H}. If it is by the same hand as the rest of the verse, it only adds to the evidence of ungenuineness. Houb. reads במלאכית or במלאכות בית.—לאמר Om. 𝔖.—ליהוה] 𝔖 adds צבאות. —פחת] *Cf.* note on 1^{1}.—**14.** ויאת־רוח] Some edd. accent with *zaq. gad.*; but see Baer, Notes, 80; Wickes, *HPA.*, 83.—כל שארית העם] 𝔊 (𝔏𝔙) τῶν καταλοίπων παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ = שארית כל העם; but 𝔊$^{\aleph Q}$ Comp., Ald. om. παντὸς; which, however, seems as much in place as in v. ^{12b}.—**15.** This verse is the first of ch. 2 in 𝔊 𝔏 𝔙 𝔖, also in the 𝔗 of the Comp., Ant., Par. and Lond. polyglots, and some separate edd. This arrangement follows the more ancient division of the text into sections, which, however, since it brings together two dates that conflict with each other at the beginning of the same paragraph, cannot represent the mind of the author. Nor is the arrangement approved by the great exegetes Jewish and Christian, which is found in 𝔐, more satisfactory; for, as Bu. remarks, "all that follows בששי is a useless appendage." Marti pronounces the whole verse an accretion, the attempt of Klo., *et al.*, to account for it as the date of a lost or misplaced prophecy being a failure. A hint of the solution of the question might have been found in *Rosh Hasshanah* (Rodkinson, *BT.*, IV, Part 2, pp. 4 *f.*, where, however, for ii, 10 one should read i, 15), where the latter half of the verse is cited as belonging to both chapters, and a still clearer indication in בששי, a solecism that can only be explained as an interpolation. If, however, this word be dropped, the preceding clause naturally attaches itself to v. ^{14}, while the one following as naturally introduces the next chapter. This is the arrangement adopted in Kittel's text, and without doubt the correct one. It seems only fair to state that the note on בששי, with the exception of the last sentence, was written before the second volume of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* appeared.—ביום] Kit. and Now., without ms. or other cited authority, rd. מיום; but, although the construction with מ after בא in the sense of החל is undoubtedly allowable (Ezr. 3^{6}), that with ב is equally good Hebrew. *Cf.* Ezr. 3^{8} 2 Ch. 3^{2}.—בששי] 𝔊 𝔏 have the equivalent of הששי, but 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 support 𝔐, and there is no ms. authority for any other reading.

§ 2. THE RESOURCES OF THE BUILDERS (1^{15b}–2^{9}).

This prophecy was designed to meet an emergency arising from the despondency that overtook the builders as soon as they realised the magnitude of their task and the slenderness of their resources. The prophet admits that they cannot hope to produce anything like the splendid temple some of them can remember, but he bids them one and all take courage, since Yahweh, whose are all the treasures of the earth, is with them and has decreed the new sanctuary a glorious future.

1^{15b}. It would have been sufficient, in dating this second prophecy, to give the month and the day of the month, but the writer chose to use here the same formula as in v. [1]. A scribe, mistaking his intent, connected the first item, ***In the second year of Darius the king***, with the preceding date of the commencement of work on the temple, and the error has only recently been discovered. It is only necessary to read the words quoted with 2^{1} to see that such was the original connection.—**2^{1}.** It was ***in the seventh month***, Tishri, ***on the twenty-first of the month***, that is, early in October, less than a month after work on the new temple was begun, that Haggai received another message from Yahweh. The date was well chosen, being the seventh day of the Feast of Tabernacles, when the people were released from labour and assembled at Jerusalem. *Cf.* Ez. 45^{25}.—**2.** He is again directed to address himself to ***Zerubbabel . . . and Joshua***, the civil and ecclesiastical heads of the community, but this time he is expressly instructed to include ***all the rest of the people***.—**3.** It doubtless cost a deal of labour, even if the ancient site had been sufficiently cleared to permit the reconstruction of the altar and the resumption of sacrifice, to remove the remaining ruins of Solomon's temple and its dependencies. While they were thus occupied the Jews must more than once have admired the stones that they were handling, and their admiration must have increased when the plan of the original complex in its generous dimensions was revealed. This feeling, however, was succeeded by an almost overwhelming discouragement, when they began to plan the new structure and realised how unworthy it would be to

take the place of the one that preceded it. The disparity was most keenly felt by a few who were old enough—it had been only sixty-seven years since it was destroyed—to have seen the house of Yahweh *in its former wealth*.* It is these aged men and women who are *left*, having survived the lamentable catastrophe in which the kingdom of David was destroyed, whom the prophet now addresses. The wealth to which he refers is not the original glory of the national sanctuary, for it had been plundered more than once before any one then living was born.

1. Those who identify the Darius in whose reign Haggai prophesied with Darius Nothus are obliged to interpret the first question as implying that there was no one present who had seen Solomon's temple; which makes the second question meaningless.

2. When Shishak came up "against Jerusalem" in the reign of Rehoboam, "he took away the treasures of the house of Yahweh" as well as of "the king's house" (1 K. $14^{25 f.}$). A century later, when Hazael threatened the capital, "Jehoash took all the hallowed things that Jehoshaphat, and Jehoram, and Ahaziah, his fathers, kings of Judah, had dedicated, and his own hallowed things, and all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of Yahweh and the king's house, and sent it to Hazael king of Syria." *Cf.* 2 K. $12^{17 f.}$. Still later, Ahaz, having become a vassal of Tiglath-pileser III, sacrificed the oxen that supported the great sea in the court of the priests and other brazen objects "because of the king of Assyria." *Cf.* 2 K. $16^{17 f.}$. Finally Hezekiah, to appease Sennacherib, "gave him all the silver that was found in the house of Yahweh." Moreover, "at that time Hezekiah stripped the doors of the temple of Yahweh, and the pillars that Hezekiah, king of Judah, had overlaid, and gave (the gold) to the king of Assyria." *Cf.* 2 K. $18^{15 f.}$.

The reference is rather to that which it retained before Nebuchadrezzar took it the first time and doubtless emptied its coffers, although he spared some, at least, of the sacred utensils. *Cf.* Je. $27^{18 ff.}$. The statement of 2 K. 24^{13}, to the effect that the temple was then completely stripped, is contradicted, not only by this passage from Jeremiah, but by 2 K. $25^{13 ff.}$. It was then, however, in the last stage of its history, still rich enough to leave an impression on these old people which made the structure now begun seem but a sorry imitation. Haggai, therefore, is only voicing their disappointment when he says, *And how do ye see it now?* what think ye of its successor? *Is it not as naught in your eyes?*—**4.** The prophet

* The Chronicler (Ezr. $3^{10 ff.}$) has an affecting description of their disappointment based on this passage.

did not by these questions intend to increase the prevailing discouragement. They are simply a rhetorical device by which, as in 1[6], he sought to bring himself into sympathy with his people, that he might comfort them in their unhappy condition. It is not strange, therefore, to find that he has no sooner put the questions than, with the words *But now*, he completely changes his tone and proceeds to bid them *be strong*, take courage, in spite of the gloominess of the present prospect, *and work*, carry the work they have undertaken to completion. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 28[20] Ezr. 10[4]. He adds to the impressiveness of his exhortation by mentioning the leaders, Zerubbabel and Joshua, by name, and supplements it with the assurance, *I am with you, saith Yahweh.* For the *people* of v.[2] the prophet here uses *people of the land*, a phrase which implies, not, as Kosters claims, that there were no returned captives among them (*WI.*, 17), but that as yet these persons were not recognised as a party.—**5.** In 𝔊 v. [4b] is immediately followed by the words, *and my spirit abideth in your midst.* The parallelism between the two is complete, abundantly warranting the conclusion that this was the original relation, and that therefore the clause which now intervenes is an interpolation. This opinion is confirmed by the prosaic character of the clause itself, *which thing I promised you when ye came forth from Egypt.* The glossator, as he read v. [4b], was evidently reminded by the words of Haggai of something similar in the history of the Exodus, and made this comment on the edge of his roll; whence it was afterward, by a copyist, incorporated into the text. *Cf.* Is. 6[8] 7[8. 17. 20] 9[15/14], etc. There are several passages any one of which he may have had in mind, but, as there is none that corresponds closely in its phraseology to the prophet's statement, and the Jews have always allowed themselves great liberty in the matter of references to their Scriptures, it is hardly possible to identify the particular passage or passages here meant. The one that most naturally suggests itself is Ex. 33[14], but the covenant between Yahweh and his people is more prominent in Ex. 19[5] and elsewhere. *V.* Ex. 29[45 f.], where Yahweh promises to dwell in the sanctuary concerning which and its worship he has just given directions. This would strike a Jewish reader as a particularly appropriate citation under

the circumstances. The idea of the prophet, of course, was that Yahweh would be present, not to glorify the temple, when it was completed, but to assist the people in rebuilding it, an idea which is simply repeated in the second member of the distich. Here, therefore, the *Spirit* of Yahweh is not an emanation, as often in the Old Testament (Gn. 41^{38} Ex. 31^{3} Ju. 13^{25} 1 S. 16^{13} 1 K. 10^{24} Is. 11^{2}), but, like "the angel of Yahweh," a manifestation of his personal presence.*

6. Thus far the prophet has been speaking of internal conditions and the means by which they may be improved. The people are suffering from repeated failures of their crops. The prophet explains the situation as a penalty for neglecting to rebuild the ruined temple. He therefore urges them to restore the sanctuary, promising them the assistance of Yahweh in the undertaking. At this point his vision is so extended that he is able to see the new structure, not only completed, but enriched beyond the fondest dreams of his generation. Yahweh has decreed it, and he will in *yet a little while* begin to put his benign purpose into execution. Haggai's idea seems to be that there will be a startling display of the divine omnipotence in the realm of nature. *I will shake heaven and earth*, he represents Yahweh as saying. The prophets all believed in the power of God over the physical world. They saw a special manifestation of that power in any unusual phenomenon, and, when it was destructive, interpreted it as a sign of Yahweh's displeasure. The imagery here used was evidently suggested by the storms that sometimes sweep over Palestine. It is found in the very earliest Hebrew literature. *Cf.* Ju. $5^{4\,f.}$. The earlier prophets adopted it. For fine examples, see Is. $2^{12\,ff.}$ Na. $1^{3\,ff.}$. The later prophets employed it with other similar material in their pictures of the inauguration of the Messianic era. *Cf.* Ez. $33^{19\,ff.}$ Is. 13^{13} $24^{18\,ff.}$ Jo. $4/3^{15\,f.}$, etc. The extravagance of some of these representations makes it probable that they finally became merely a literary form for the assertion of the divine omnipotence. See the "visions" of these same prophets. The phrase, *and the sea and the dry land*, must be treated as a gloss by a prosaic copyist.

* *Cf.* Ps. $139^{4/7}$, but especially Is. 63^{9-14}; also Davidson, *Theol.*, 125 *f.*; Piepenbring, *Theol.*, 156 *f.*

This is an improvement in more ways than one. In the first place, it permits the transfer of the first clause of v. [7] to this one, to form a distich both members of which receive additional significance through their union with each other. The first has already been discussed. The second, *yea, I will shake all nations*, introduces the ultimate purpose of the convulsion predicted, namely, to humble the nations. These words were uttered in October 520 B.C. They cannot, therefore, be taken as a prediction of the uprising in the East against Darius;—it had begun in the preceding year;—but they must be interpreted as indicating the expectation of the prophet with reference to the war then in progress. He had probably not yet heard of the capture of Babylon and the energy that Darius was displaying in a second campaign in Media. He therefore, apparently, hoped and believed that the conflict would result in the disintegration of the Persian empire and the complete liberation of the Jews as well as the other subject peoples. For a more detailed description of the catastrophe, see v. [22].—**7.** A second advantage from the removal of the first clause of this verse to end of v. [6] is that it loosens the connection between the clause in question and the following context. It surely cannot have been the idea of the prophet that *the treasures of all the nations* were to be shaken from them like fruit from a tree. Yet this is the impression that one gets from the text as now arranged. *Cf.* Nowack. Make the change proposed, and the oreak between the verses will prevent such an inference and permit the reader to supply an important omission in this brief outline of Yahweh's purpose. The prophet, of course, must have expected that, after the present convulsion, the nations liberated by it would be so impressed by the power of Yahweh that they would recognise him as the Ruler of the world. He knew that this was the oft-avowed object of Yahweh in his government. *Cf.* Is. $45^{5.\ 15.\ 22\,f.}$, etc. He therefore represents the Deity as saying that the things in which the nations delight *shall come*, *i. e.*, as voluntary offerings, to the temple now in process of erection, and that by this means he *will fill this house with wealth*. The older commentators, following the Vulgate (*veniat desideratus cunctis gentibus*), interpreted this verse as referring to the Messiah, citing the

incidents recorded in Lk. $2^{22.\,28}$ as the fulfilment of Haggai's prophecy;* but this interpretation is now generally abandoned, for it is clear from v. [8] that the *wealth*, or, as EV. has it, the *glory*, of the last clause is that of silver and gold, and that therefore, as above explained, it is not a delightful person, but precious things, that are destined to come to the new sanctuary. *Cf.* Is. $60^{9.\,11}$.—**8.** There can be no doubt of Yahweh's ability to fulfil this promise. *Mine*, he says, *is the silver, and mine is the gold*, *i. e.*, the whole store of these metals, whether current among men or still hidden in the bowels of the earth.—**9.** The offerings brought will be so many and valuable that *the future wealth of this house*—not, as the Vulgate has it,† *the wealth of this latter house*—will be *greater than the past*. The expression *this house* here, as in v. [3], means the temple regarded as having a continuous existence (Pres.), in spite of its ruined or unfinished condition. By its *past* (*former*) wealth, therefore, is meant the wealth it possessed before it was burned. Yahweh promises, not only to enrich this his abode, but to bless Jerusalem. *In this place*, he says, *I will grant prosperity*. The word rendered *prosperity*‡ is used in the Old Testament in the sense of quiet, especially as opposed to the unrest of war. Thus, by the Prince of Peace (Is. $9^{6/5}$), as appears from Is. $11^{1\,ff.}$, the prophet doubtless meant a ruler who would introduce tranquillity. *Cf.* Ez. 34^{25} Is. $32^{17\,f.}$. It more frequently, however, signifies *welfare, prosperity*. *Cf.* Ps. $122^{7\,ff.}$. This is the sense of it in the familiar salutation, lit., *Is there prosperity?* which is translated, *Is it well?* Gn. 29^{6}, *et pas.*, and probably in the corresponding benediction. *Cf.* 1 S. 25^{6}, but especially Nu. 6^{26}. This signification is most noticeable in passages in which the Hebrew word is used antithetically. *Cf.* 1 S. $20^{7.\,21}$ Is. 45^{7} Je. 23^{17}. Now, Jeremiah in 29^{11}, where he foretold the return from exile, used the word in this latter sense, assuring his people that Yahweh was cherish-

* For an elaborate defence of this view, see Pusey, whose quotation from Cicero's letters is entirely unwarranted.

† So, also, Luther, AV., Marck, Cal., Dru., Grotius, Hd., Reuss, And., van H., *et al.* This would require that האחרון come *before*, and not, as in the text, *after* הזה. *Cf.* Ex. 3^{3}, etc., Ges. § 126. 5. In 2 Ch. 1^{10}, where the two attributives appear in the reverse order, the text, as one may learn from 𝔊, should be emended to make it conform to the rule.

‡ שָׁלוֹם.

ing toward them "thoughts of welfare, and not of evil" in a hopeful future; and this, in view of the preceding references to wealth, is probably the thought that Haggai here wishes to convey.*

1. בּיד] This form of expression is not in harmony with אמר of v. ^{2}. If, therefore, the latter is retained, as it must be to account for the *λέγων· εἰπὸν* of 1^{1} in 𝔊, the former, in spite of the adverse testimony of the mss. and Vrss., must be changed to אל. *Cf.* the notes on 1^{1}; also Bu., *ZAW.*, 1906, 9.—**2.** אֱמָר] Not an Aram. impv. (And.), but the regular Heb. form shortened (*δ*), as usual before an appended נא. *Cf.* Ju. 12^{6} Je. 18^{11}, etc. —פחת] *Cf.* note on 1^{1}.—שארית] So 𝔗 𝔙; but, since there is no reason why the same formula should not be used as in $1^{12.14}$, and 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖 actually have it, it seems safe to conclude that the original reading here also was כל שארית. So Now., Marti, Kit.; *contra*, And.—**3.** הנשאר] Om. 𝔊 𝔏. Hence, although it has the support of 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, its genuineness is not unquestionable. On the art. *cf.* Zc. 7^{6}; Ges. §§ $^{116.5(c)\,r.1;\,126.2(f)\,r.}$—On מה in the sense of *how*, *cf.* Gn. 44^{16} 1 S. 10^{27}, etc.—**4.** The omission of בן שאלתיאל is as noticeable as the occurrence of הכהן הגדול in direct address; yet there is no evidence to warrant the insertion of the former or the omission of the latter. *Cf.* v. ^{20} Zc. 3^{8}. We. in his translation omits all but the two names; inconsistently, since in v. ^{23} he retains בן שאלתיאל, and in Zc. 3^{8} הכהן הגדול.—To יהוה^{1} 𝔊^{L} adds *παντοκράτωρ* = צבאות, and 𝔏 𝔙 do the same for יהוה^{2}. On the other hand, 𝔊$^{\aleph^{c.b}\,AQ\,\Gamma L}$ omit the צבאות that follows יהוה^{3}; but since the prophet seems to have followed no rule in the use of the divine names, and the verses contain many evident errors made in translating or copying them, it does not seem safe in either case to reject the Massoretic reading. *Cf.* v. ^{23}.—**5.** The first half of this verse is certainly a gloss. (1) As already explained in the comments, it breaks the connection between two clauses which were evidently meant for a parallelism. (2) No attempt to construe it with the context has proven satisfactory. It will not do to make את דבר the obj. of עשׂו, expressed, 𝔙, or understood, Rosenm.; for this vb. does not need an obj. (Ezr. 10^{4} 1 Ch. 3^{10}), and, if it took one, the thing commanded would be, not the fulfilment of Yahweh's promises, but work on the temple. It is equally objectionable to couple את דבר with either אתכם, Marck, or רוחי, Hi., Hd., Köh., since in either case the balance between the parallel clauses is destroyed and דבר invested with an unnatural meaning. (3) The whole clause is wanting in 𝔊 (exc. a few curss.) 𝔏 𝔖^{H}. These reasons seem convincing. When, however, the relation of the clause to the context has been determined, there remains room for difference of opinion about the construction of את דבר. Some would supply a vb. like זכר,

* If this interpretation is correct, it has a bearing on a question that will be found discussed at length in the textual notes.

Ew., others treat the noun as an adverbial acc., EV.; but, as there are serious objections to both of these methods of disposing of it, the better way is, with de Dieu, to regard it as an appositive of the preceding promise attracted into the case of the following rel. *Cf.* Ez. 14[22]; Ges. § 117. 1. r. 7; also the precisely similar construction in the Greek of Ac. 10[36].—**6.** עוד אחת מעט היא] The text is evidently corrupt. The best explanation of the present reading, We., is that it is the result of the confusion of two idioms, one of which is represented by the *Yet once* of 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖. *Cf.* Heb. 12[26 f.]. The emendation proposed by We., following Sm., however, is not completely satisfactory. The original, as he suggests, doubtless had the idiom with מעט. In that case, however, it is not enough to omit אחת. The pron. היא, which refers to it, and in fact has no other function, must also be eliminated. The original, then, must have been עוד מעט, which is regularly followed by ו. *Cf.* Ex. 17[4], etc. That of 𝔐 may be explained by supposing that מעט was mistaken for פעם (Ne. 18[20]) by the Greek translators, and that אחת with היא arose from an attempt to correct 𝔐 from 𝔊 by the use of the idiom of Ex. 30[10], etc.—ואת הים ואת החרבה] Evidently a gloss, for (1) it not only unduly lengthens one of the members of a parallelism, but (2) introduces details inconsistent with the context which belong to the field of the later apocalypses. *Cf.* Jo. 3[4 f.]/2[30 f.] Is. 24[18 ff.], etc.—**7.** On v. [b] *v.* Com.—חמדת] So 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗; but 𝔊 𝔏 have the pl., which is also required by באו. Hence the original must have been חֲמֻדֹת. *Cf.* Gn. 27[15]. So Houb., Seck., New., We., Now., Marti, Kit.; but Che., *CB*., suggests סְגֻלֹּת.—אמר יהוה צבאות] The rarity of this form of expression in Hg. and Zc., as already noted (1[5]), excites suspicion. Here and in v. [9] the fact that it disturbs the rhythm is an additional reason for pronouncing it an accretion.—**8.** נאם]. Three mss., Kenn., have אמר, but in this case it is an error for נאם.—**9.** כבד הבית הזה האחרון] 𝔙, *gloria domus istius novissimæ*. *V.* Com.—אמר יהוה צבאות] *Cf.* v. [7].—𝔊 adds at the end, καὶ εἰρήνην ψυχῆς εἰς περιποίησιν παντὶ τῷ κτίζοντι, τοῦ ἀναστῆσαι τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον = *even peace of soul unto preservation to every one that layeth foundations to erect this temple* = ושלוה נפש לםחיה לכל יסד לקומם את ההיכל הזה. These words, however, cannot be a part of the original prophecy. Jer. gives the reasons for rejecting them when he characterises the passage as "superfluous and hardly consistent," and notes that they were not regarded as genuine "among the Hebrews or by any exegete." The inconsistency consists in this, that, while the thing predicted by Hg., as has been shown, is prosperity, that here promised is inward and spiritual tranquillity. It is not probable that the prophet went from the one to the other of these conceptions without warning and within the brief limits of a single sentence.

§ 3. THE NEW ERA OF THE RESTORED TEMPLE (2^{10-19}).

A few weeks after Haggai's second discourse there was occasion for a third. The people were disappointed that Yahweh did not at once testify his appreciation of their zeal in the restoration of his sanctuary. The prophet, after an illustration calculated to show them the unreasonableness of the complaint, promises that henceforth they shall see a difference.

10. It was *the twenty-fourth of the ninth month*, that is, in December, a little more than two months from the preceding date, when Haggai was again moved to address his people. The date is not that of any of the regular festivals. Nor is there ground for supposing, with André, that it was an occasion for special offerings; certainly not in v. [14], for the sacrifices there mentioned belong, not to the date of the prophecy, but to a preceding period.—**11.** This time also he begins abruptly, as if interrupting an opponent, leaving the reader to imagine what had given rise to the discussion, and what had previously been said by each of the disputants. The general situation can readily be conceived. The people, if they had been stimulated to renewed activity in their work on the temple by the inspiring picture of its future glory which the prophet had presented to them, were again beginning to lose interest in the enterprise. From the first utterance of Zechariah ($1^{1\,ff.}$), who had meanwhile begun his career, it appears that some, at least, among them were not in a condition to appreciate the religious significance of the new sanctuary. The excuse that all gave for their indifference or discouragement seems to have been that, although it had now been three months since they began operations, Yahweh had as yet given them no token of his approval. This seemed to them unjust, but Yahweh, speaking through the prophet, defends himself, using an illustration that his hearers would readily understand. He takes it from the sphere of ceremonial, concerning which one would naturally *ask the priests for instruction*. *Cf.* Zc. $7^{3\,f.}$ Lv. $10^{10\,f.}$. The fact that the matter is referred to them shows, as Wellhausen observes, that the fountain

from which flowed much of the Pentateuch was in Haggai's time still open.—**12.** The case is a hypothetical one: *If a man*, not necessarily a priest, *carry holy flesh*, flesh that has been offered to Yahweh (Je. 11^{15}),* *in the skirt of his robe*, which, if not already holy, is thereby rendered holy (Lv. $6^{27/20}$), *and touch with his skirt*, not with the flesh in it, *bread*, etc., not yet offered. The question is whether in such a case the food so touched *will become holy*. In other words, is the holiness imparted by a sacred object to another transmitted by this second object to a third, when the last two are brought into contact? Thus far the command of Yahweh to Haggai. *Cf.* v. [10]. For completeness' sake it should be followed by a statement that the prophet, thus instructed, put the prescribed question to the priests; for it was the prophet, and not Yahweh, to whom *the priests answered and said, No.* There was a reason, and a good one, for this decision, but, since the prophet omits it, and it has no importance in the present connection, it does not deserve special attention.—**13.** The lesson Haggai wished to teach has two sides to it. His first question was meant to throw light upon the negative side. He proceeds to illustrate the positive by a corresponding question: *If one unclean from* contact with, or proximity to, *a dead person*, lit., *a soul*,† *touch any of these, will it*, the bread or other food, *become unclean?* To this the priests reply, *It will become unclean. Cf.* Nu. 19^{22}. In other words, uncleanness imparted to a given person or object communicates itself to a third person or object by contact.—**14.** A glance at this verse is enough to convince one that the application of the prophet's parable was meant to convey disapproval. The expressions *this people* and *this nation* give it a sinister tone. *Cf.* 1^{2}. When, however, one looks a little further, one realises that his ultimate object is to encourage his people. This conflict of ideas must in some way be adjusted. It cannot be done by rendering the verse as a description of the actual condition of the Jews when the prophet was addressing them, for in that way the contradiction is made even

* In later times it was largely reserved for the priests (Lv. 6^{26} 7^{6}), but the worshipper always had a share in the peace-offerings. *Cf.* Lv. $7^{15\,ff.}$.

† The earliest reference to the uncleanness of the dead is found in Ho. 9^{4}. *Cf.* also Dt. 26^{14}. For the later laws see Nu. $19^{11\,ff.}$, and for a fuller discussion of the subject, *DB.*, art. *Uncleanness*; Benzinger, *Arch.*, 480 *f*.

more apparent. The only other alternative is to make it refer to the past and explain the previous experience of the people. Translate, therefore, *So hath it been with this people, and so with this nation before me, saith Yahweh.* It is clear that the prophet here neglects his first question, and confines himself to a direct application of the second. If so, what he means is that the Jews in some way, he does not here say how, brought themselves into a condition similar to that of one who has become unclean from contact with a dead body. Now, the priests had said that uncleanness was contagious. It is natural, therefore, to expect that the prophet will here make an application of this important fact, and the next clause, *yea, so with all the work of their hands*, seems to meet this expectation. But what is meant by the *work* or—for this is a possible rendering—*works* of their hands? This expression in one of the earlier prophetical books would be understood as a reference to the conduct or practices of those who were addressed. *Cf.* Am. 8^{7} Je. 25^{14}. Such, however, can hardly be the thought in this connection. In the first place, since Haggai nowhere else alludes to the sins for which his predecessors arraigned their contemporaries, it is not probable that he does so in this connection. Nor is such an interpretation in harmony with the evident purpose of the prophet, which is to apply the law of the transmission of uncleanness. There is another and better. The phrase "work of the hands" occurs several times in Deuteronomy in the sense of human undertakings, and especially agricultural operations. *Cf.* 24^{19} 28^{12} 30^{9}. The transition from the operation to the product is natural and easy. It is actually made in v. ^{17}, where "the works of your hands" can mean nothing but the crops. *Cf.* also 1^{11}. It is therefore probable that in this passage the prophet intends to say that the people have in some way defiled themselves and communicated their uncleanness to the products of their labor, the grain they have sowed and reaped and the cattle they have raised. Thus it came to pass that *what they* from time to time *offered* on the altar already erected *was unclean.* Haggai does not say how the people defiled themselves, but it is easy enough to learn what he thought on the subject. Their great fault in his eyes was that they had neglected to rebuild the temple and thus prevented the

return of Yahweh and the introduction of the Messianic era. He charged them with it at the start (1^4), and he alludes to it again in the next verse. This it was that had defiled them and rendered their worship offensive to Yahweh. Haggai does not return to his first question. If he had, and had undertaken to complete the twofold thought with which he began, he would doubtless have said in effect that the meagre worship his people paid to Yahweh had been more than neutralised by their selfish and short-sighted indifference to the supreme duty of restoring the national sanctuary.

There have been various attempts to apply Haggai's parable in greater detail. One of the most elaborate is that of André, the result of which is as follows: The man bearing the holy flesh = Israel. The garment in which it is borne = Palestine. The skirt of the garment = Jerusalem. The holy flesh = the altar. The bread, etc. = the products of the soil. The altar sanctified the land, but not its products. The man defiled = Israel. The corpse = the ruined temple. The bread, etc. = the products of the soil. The ruined temple defiled the sacrifices offered on the temporary altar.

15. *And now*, says the prophet, as if about to introduce a contrast to the previous state of things. He is, but not until he has shown the unhappy results of the failure of the people to please Yahweh. The subject is an important one. Hence the impressive warning, *take thought*, as he approaches it. He first reminds his people of their condition *before a stone was placed upon another in the temple of Yahweh*, that is, for an indefinite period before work was begun on the new temple.*—**16.** During that unhappy period, *when one came to a heap of twenty measures*, a pile of unthreshed or unwinnowed grain from which one would ordinarily get this amount, the yield was so light that *there were* actually only *ten*. The returns from the vineyards were still less satisfactory; for, *when one came to the winevat* expecting *to dip off fifty measures* of must, he found that *there were* only *twenty*. *Cf.* Is. 5^{10}. Disappointments of this kind are still so frequent in Palestine that they have given rise to the proverb, "The reckoning of the threshing-floor does not tally with that of the field." *Cf.* Wilson, PLHL., 309.

* The phrase rendered in AV. *from this day and upward* is purposely ignored.

The wine-presses in southern Palestine were excavated in the limestone which underlies the soil. *Cf.* Ju. 6[11] Is. 5[2]. They consisted of two vats on different levels, the one larger and shallower for the grapes, the other smaller and deeper for their juice. They were separated by a partition of native rock pierced by a hole by which the juice flowed from the one to the other. There was no uniformity in the size of either receptacle. Nor was the number of vats always two. There were sometimes three, or even four. *Cf. EB.*, art. *Wine; PEF.*, *QS.*, 1899, 41 *f.*; *ZDPV.*, x, 146.

17. There follows a careless or corrupt quotation from Amos with additions. The object of it is to explain the failure of the crops as just described. It was due to the direct intervention of Yahweh. *I smote you*, he says, *with blight and decay*. These are the precise words of Am. 4[9]. Haggai, if the next clause is genuine, adds in a more prosaic style, *and with hail all the work of your hands*, that is, as in v. [14], the crops for which they had toiled. All this is appropriate enough; but the remainder of the verse, which is an imitation or a corruption of the familiar refrain, "yet ye returned not unto me, saith Yahweh," used by Amos, 4[6 ff.], no fewer than five times, is out of place in this connection, the object of the prophet being to emphasise, not the stubbornness of the people, but the unhappiness of their circumstances. It is probable, therefore, that this part of the verse is a late addition made by a reader who thought it necessary here, as in the prophecy of Amos, to complete the thought.—**18.** Now, at length, comes the transition indicated by the *And now* of v. [15]. The prophet, therefore, seeks to revive the impression then produced by repeating the warning, *take thought*. It is the future, however, on which he now wishes to focus attention, the period, as he describes it, *from this time onward*. The exact date of this turning-point is given. It is the date of the present discourse, *the twenty-fourth of the ninth month*. *Cf.* v. [10]. So great precision was not necessary for those to whom the prophecy was originally addressed or those for whom the book of Haggai was finally compiled. Moreover, this date rather disturbs the balance of the verse and emphasises an avoidable difficulty. It is, therefore, probably an interpolation. When it is removed the phrase just used is brought into close connection with the clause which was evidently intended to define it. This clause is usually translated *from the day when the temple was*

founded, which naturally means that the foundation of the new structure was laid on the twenty-fourth of the ninth month; as the glossator expressly teaches.

The conflict between this inference and the statement of Ezr. $3^{8\,ff.}$ is evident. A favourite method of adjusting it is to suppose that the prophet here refers, not to a first movement to rebuild the temple, but to the renewal of one begun in the second year of the reign of Cyrus and after a little suppressed. So Dru., de D., Hi., Köh., Or., *et al.* It is not, however, necessary to adopt such an explanation, much less to torture familiar idioms for the sake of bringing this passage into accord with one that has been shown to be unhistorical. On the historicity of Ezr. $3^{8\,ff.}$ *v.* pp. 10 *f.*; on the idioms ומעלה and למן, the critical notes. There is more in the objection that, according to 1^{15a}, work was begun on the temple three months before the date of this prophecy, and that, according to 2^{3}, at the end of about a month the builders seem to have made progress. The usual explanation for this apparent discrepancy is that the work begun on the twenty-fourth of the sixth month was that of clearing the site and providing materials for the new building. So Dru., de D., Marck, Hi., Köh., Sta., We., *et al.* Now. objects that it could not have taken three months to make the preparations named, and argues therefrom that the clause above quoted, as well as the date, is ungenuine. The objection is a fair one and the conclusion valid against the clause—as translated, but there is room for doubt whether the rendering above given does justice to the original.

What is wanted here is a parallel to v. ^{15b}. Now, in that clause it is not a date, but a period and the condition of things during that period, which are described. Moreover the condition is presented as a reason or explanation for a given result. It was when (and because) a stone had not been placed upon another in the temple of Yahweh that the crops had failed. The construction in this case is the same and the connection perfectly analogous. The passage should therefore be rendered, *from the time when the temple hath been founded*, that is, now that the temple has been founded. That this is the prophet's meaning appears because the passage, so rendered, (1) furnishes a perfect parallel to v. ^{15b}, (2) presents a reason for the blessing promised in v. ^{19} and (3) harmonises 1^{15b} and 2^{3}.—**19.** There was danger that some of those whom Haggai was addressing would take his words too literally, supposing that Yahweh would at once give them a convincing token of a change of attitude toward them. The prophet took pains to prevent them from falling into this error. The divine displeasure had been manifested by a blight upon agriculture. The prophet

expected that Yahweh would manifest his favour by giving rain in its season and, as a result, abundant harvests. It was now, however, too early, December, to look for tangible evidence to this effect. The grain, to be sure, had been sown, and the fields were already green with it, but there would be some weeks before any one could tell whether the crop would be great or small, and the harvest for the vineyard and the orchard was still further in the future. This is the thought that the prophet has in mind when, in his abrupt manner, as if again answering an objection, he asks, *Is the seed*, here, as in Lv. 27^{30} and elsewhere, the return from the grain sown, the crop, *already in the granary?* A negative answer is expected. In the following clause the negative is found in the prophet's statement, *nor have the vine, and the fig, and the pomegranate, and the olive tree yet borne*, that is, had time to bear. In other words, there has been no harvest since work on the temple was begun. This being the case, the prophet sees no ground for discouragement. Indeed he proceeds to transform this negative inference into positive assurance. He believes, not only that Yahweh has been propitiated, but that he has already decreed a satisfactory harvest. He therefore closes the discourse by putting into his mouth the promise, *From this time will I bless.*

10. The transfer of 1^{15b} to this chapter brought the date at the head of the chapter into conformity with that in 1^{1}. At the same time it indicated the type that the author might be expected to follow. The fact that the date here given has a different form warrants a suspicion that the phrase, בשנת שתים לדריוש, which, moreover, is unnecessary, has been added.—אל] Here there has been a struggle between אל and ביד. There is authority for both of them, but the former is the one required by the context. *Cf.* שאל, v. [11]. It is also the reading of 80 mss., and, among the earliest edd., Sonc. [1486. 1488], Bres., Pes. [1515. 1517], Ven. [1517. 1521]. Finally it has the support of 𝔊 𝔏 𝔙 𝔖[H]. *Cf.* Baer, Gins.—**11.** There is one objection to אל, viz., that, if it is adopted, Yahweh is here made to appeal to his own authority. This, however, is not serious. Here, as in Zc. 8^{18}, כה אמר יהוה צבאות was used by the prophet or inserted by a copyist as a mere formula, without a second thought with reference to its appropriateness in the connection. If it is an interpolation, its history is probably involved with that of ביד.—שאל] 𝔖, which has ביד, consistently renders this word as if it were pl.—**12.** הן] The word is usually treated as an Aramaism, but, as used here, it is not properly a hypothetical particle.

Its force is rather that of a demonstrative calling attention to an act the result of which is to be considered. So Ex. 4^{1} $8^{22/26}$ (both J); BDB. On the accentuation, *v.* Baer, Notes, 80; Wickes, *HPA.*, 118.—כנפו] Kenn. 30 has כנף בגדו. So also 𝔊 𝔏; and Bu. adopts this reading. It is probable, however, since בגד is usually omitted, that the repetition of the full expression is due to dittog. *Cf.* Dt. $23^{1}/22^{30}$ Ez. 16^{8} Zc. 8^{23}, etc.—שמן] Rd., with 18 mss., Kenn., השמן. *Cf.* הלחם, etc.—**13.** חגי] On the omission of הנביא, see p. 30.—נפש] For נפש מת, lit., ***the soul of one dead.*** *Cf.* Lv. 21^{11} Nu. 6^{6}, and on the construction, Ges. § 118. 5 (c). Sometimes נפש is preceded by ל. *Cf.* Nu. 5^{2} 9^{10}.—בכל] On the preposition, *cf.* Ges. § 119. 3 (b) (2); on כל in the sense of *any*, Ges. § 134. 1 (c) r. 1 (c).—לא] For לא יקדש. *Cf.* v. 12; Ges. § 150. 3.—**14.** כן העם הזה] Böh. om. this clause as superfluous, forgetting, apparently, that Hebrew writers often resort to repetition for emphasis. *Cf.* Is 1^{4}.—מעשה] A cstr. sg., with a dependent pl., may itself have the force of pl. *Cf.* Ges. § 124. 2 (c). Hence it is not necessary to rd. מעשי to account for the pl. in 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖 𝔗.—ויקריבו] The impf., to denote customary action. *Cf.* Ges. § 107. 1 (b).—𝔊 renders the whole clause *καὶ ὃς ἐὰν ἐγγίσῃ ἐκεῖ μιανθήσεται.*—𝔊 (𝔏) adds at the end of the verse, *ἕνεκεν τῶν λημμάτων αὐτῶν τῶν ὀρθρινῶν ὀδυνηθήσονται ἀπὸ προσώπου πόνων αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμισεῖτε ἐν πύλαις ἐλέγχοντας*; *on account of their early gains they shall suffer from their labours, and they hate in gates one that reproveth.* This gloss, the last words of which are from Am. 5^{12}, seems to have been translated from the Hebrew, *τῶν ὀρθρινῶν* being evidently the result of mistaking שחד, *bribe*, for שחר, *dawn*. It has no fitness in this connection.—**15.** מן היום הזה ומעלה] This phrase, when applied to time, always elsewhere refers to the future. *Cf.* 1 S. 16^{13} 30^{25}. Still, the older exegetes, taking the words that follow as an explanation, felt forced to interpret it as referring to the past, the period preceding the date of this prophecy. So Jer., Ra., Dru., Marck, Hi., Ew., Köh.; also Reuss, Sta., Per., Kau., BDB., *et al.* An ingenious modification of this view is that of van H., who renders the whole verse, "*Portez votre attention de ce jour-ci et au dela, depuis qu' on ne plaçait pas encore pierre sur pierre dans le temple de Jahvé,*" *i. e.*, as he explains, "*depuis le premier jour de la période durant laquelle on différa constamment d'élever les murs sur les fondements déjà prêts.*" In other words, he claims that the prophet would first lead the minds of his auditors backward to the date on which operations supposed to have been begun under Cyrus were discontinued, and thence onward over the period between that date and the one on which he was speaking. The objections to this interpretation are: (1) that it takes for granted the historicity of Ezr. $3^{8\,ff.}$; (2) that it gives to ומעלה a meaning for which there is no authority; and (3) that it makes the whole phrase a hinderance rather than an assistance in any attempt to understand the prophet's message. These objections are avoided by giving to ומעלה, with Secker, the meaning that it has elsewhere. If, however, it

refers to the future, how can this interpretation be harmonised with the fact that in the latter half of the verse the prophet is evidently thinking of the past? Pressel meets this difficulty by putting a full stop after ומעלה, thus making vv. [15b-16] a parenthesis. So Now., Matthes, Marti, Bu., And. The result thus obtained is no doubt in harmony with the prophet's idea, but there is a simpler way of reaching it, viz., by treating the whole phrase, מן היום הזה ומעלה, as an interpolation. This method has obvious advantages: (1) The prophet is thus relieved of responsibility for an awkward and unnatural construction. (2) The attention of the reader is called first to the past and then to the future, just as it is in 1[5. 8]. (3) It is much more reasonable to suppose that a careless scribe intentionally or unintentionally inserted the phrase, because it occurred in v. [18], than that the prophet himself introduced it before he had any use for it.—מטרם] The only case in which טרם is preceded by מן or followed by the inf. On Zp. 2[2], *cf.* Kit.—אל] 𝔊, ἐπί; 𝔖 𝔗, על; 𝔏 𝔙, *supra* = על. —**16.** מהיותם] The text is clearly corrupt, but it is not so plain how it should be emended. Matthes (*ZAW.*, 1903, 125 *f.*), following 𝔊 (τίνες ἦτε) 𝔏, rds. מה הייתם, *How was it with you?* So Marti. Bu. prefers מי הייתם as more idiomatic. *Cf.* Ru. 3[16] Am. 7[2. 5]. Neither of these readings is favoured by the other Vrss., which render מהיותם באים as if it were מהיותכם באים; a form of expression that actually occurs in Gn. 34[25]. Thus 𝔙 has *cum accederetis*, 𝔖, ܡܢ ܕܐܠܟܝ ܗܘܝܬܘܢ and 𝔗, מדהויתון עלין. Something to this effect is required by the context. The following is suggested as the original reading: בהיות ימי, *while the days were*, during the time when. The changes made are all justifiable. The prep. ב is required, because the prophet is dealing with a period, and not a point, of time. The construction in which a cstr., especially of יום or עת, is followed by a descriptive clause is a familiar one. *Cf.* Ges. § [155. 2 (b) (3) r. 1]. In 2 Ch. 24[11], as in this case, the vb. has an indefinite subj. *Cf.* also Lv. 7[35] Dt. 32[35], etc. Finally, it should be noted that the reading suggested has the support of several good authorities to the extent that these scholars interpret the sf. ם as meaning יום or ימי. So Dru., Mau., Hi., Köh., Hd., *et al.*—בא אל ערמת עשרים] 𝔊, ὅτε ἐνεβάλλετε εἰς κυψέλην κριθῆς εἴκοσι σάτα, where κριθῆς, which is wanting in L, seems to have been suggested by the resemblance of עשרים, *twenty*, to שערים, *barley*.—פורה] The word has been interpreted in two ways: First, as a measure. So probably 𝔗, גברין, and explicitly Ra. and some later commentators. *Cf.* Mau., Hd., *et al.* If this interpretation were correct, there would still be room for doubting the genuineness of the word, since there is no more need of a measure here than in the first half of the verse. *Cf.* Ru. 3[15]; Ges. § [134. 8. r. 8]. It is clear, however, from Is. 63[3] that פורה is not a measure, but practically a synonym for יקב. The same objection holds good against a modification of this view according to which פורה, although it properly means *wine-press*, here has the derived sense of *trough-*

ful. *Cf*. Hi., Köh., Ke., And., *et al*. The second interpretation is that required by Is. 63[3]. Those who adopt it, if they retain the word in the text, have to supply ב (Dru.) or מן. *Cf*. AV., Cal., Sm., We., Now., van H., *et al*. The latter, which is now the favourite reading, must be rejected for the following reasons: (1) If, as is alleged, this is a case of haplog., since the original must have been מהפורה, not מפורה, Sm., the text ought still to show הפורה. (2) There is no reason for emphasising the thought that the wine was to be drawn *from the wine-press*, and if there were, מגת would answer the purpose. There is no support for either of these views in the Vrss. 𝔊, to be sure, has μετρητάς, 𝔗 *amphoras*, and 𝔙 *lagenas*, but they have a measure in the first half of the verse also, not because 𝔐 had one, but because the Greek and Latin idioms require it. Their testimony, therefore, is valueless. That of 𝔖 is to the effect that פורה, for which it has no equivalent, is a gloss to יקב which has been inserted in the text in the wrong place. So ARV., Matthes, Marti, Kit. Houb. rd. פוכה in the sense of *jar*. The Standard Revision, also, originally had "vessels" in Italics, *i. e.*, omitted פורה; but, to use the words of Per., "the mistake (!) has now been corrected."—**17.** הכיתי —— וירקון] Taken from Amos, but not necessarily an interpolation, since the parallel clause, which should begin with ובברד, and not, as in 𝔐, with את, seems to be original.—מעשה] *Cf*. v. [14]. 𝔊 𝔗 𝔙 𝔖 have the pl. The word is in the same construction, acc., as אתכם.—The last clause, also, was borrowed from Amos, but not by Haggai; for (1) it is more carelessly reproduced than the first one, and (2) it gives to the prophet's thought a new and unnatural direction. In any case the text must be emended, אין אתכם being indefensible; Kö. § [370a]; *contra*, Ew. § [262d]; and, since אין can hardly be explained except by supposing it to be original, it seems better to rd. אין שבכם, Gins., or אינכם שבים, Bu., than לא שבתם, Kit. The whole verse is omitted by We., Now., Marti, Bu., Kit.—**18.** The same authorities reject the date in this verse, and the last three the clause that follows. The date is no doubt superfluous, p. 70, and the omission of למן —— יהוה would relieve the apparent discrepancy between this passage, on the one hand, and 1^{14-15a} and 2^{8} on the other; but, as has been shown in the Com., this latter clause is required to explain why Yahweh should now bless his people, and, when it is properly understood, its genuineness can be defended.—The force of ומעלה is here so clear that 𝔙, which in v. [15] has *et supra*, renders it this time *et in futurum*. So Marck, Seck., de D., Hi., Köh., *et al*. Those, however, who maintain that the foundation of the temple was laid in the second year of Cyrus, and that the last clause of this verse refers to that event, are obliged to translate it here, as well as in v. [15], *and backward*. So 𝔊, RV., Dru., New., Rosenm., Mau., Ew., Ke., Per., van H., *et al*. Moreover, they must do violence to למן, either, with Ew., giving it the force of עד, or practically making it do double duty, first pointing the reader to the past and

then, from a certain date in the past, turning his attention toward the present. The former of these methods of treatment entirely ignores Hebrew usage, according to which למן and ועד, so far from being interchangeable, are direct opposites. *Cf.* Ex. 11[7] 2 S. 7[6]. On the second, which is best represented by van Hoonacker, see v. [15], notes. The position taken in the comments is that למן without ועד marks the beginning of a period extending to the present, and that the foundation of the temple distinguishes and dominates the whole of it. For other examples, *cf.* Dt. 4[32] 2 S. 7[11].—If the preceding clause is retained, it is not necessary, with 𝔊 𝔖, to connect שמו לבבכם with v. [19].—יהוה] 𝔊[L] adds *παντοκράτωρ* = צבאות. 𝔖 adds ܕܚܝܠܘܬܐ ܠܡܬܒܢܝܘ, *of Hosts to be built*. *Cf.* 1[2].—**19.** במגורה] Zeydner (*Th. St.*, 1900, 417 *ff.*) rds. במורה, *an object of fear*, the ב being ב *essentiæ;* but Matthes objects, and justly, that the meaning *garner* suits the context, and that ב *essentiæ* is not used with the article. *Cf.* De. on Ps. 35[2].—ועד] Rd., with 𝔊[AQL] 𝔙 𝔗, ועֹד. On the meaning of עֹד לא, *cf.* Je. 40[5] 2 Ch. 20[33].—נשא] 𝔊, *φέροντα* = נֹשֵׂא. So Matthes, Marti, but 𝔗 𝔖 𝔙 have the equivalent of נשאו, which would be the regular construction. *Cf.* Ges. § [141. 8 (a)].—אברך] Houb. rds. אברכם, citing 𝔖, which adds at the end of the verse ܠܟܘܢ، ܐܡܪ ܡܪܝܐ = אותם נאם יהוה.

4. THE FUTURE OF THE LEADER ZERUBBABEL (2^{20-23}).

This prophecy is addressed to Zerubbabel alone. In it Haggai foretells a great catastrophe by which kings will be overthrown and kingdoms destroyed, but after which the prince, unharmed, will receive new honours from Yahweh.

20. In the preceding prophecy Haggai confined his attention to internal conditions and the prospect of improvement. Very soon after he delivered it, something must have happened to give his thoughts a different direction. Perhaps there came news from the East, the report of a new outbreak or a battle unfavourable to the Persians, which tended to confirm the opinion current in Jerusalem that the days of the empire were numbered. At any rate, on *the twenty-fourth of the* ninth *month*, *the word of Yahweh came* to him *a second time*, and he prophesied.—**21.** The message is a private and personal one. Even Joshua, who, in the first two cases, was recognised as one of the pillars of the new community, is now ignored. This fact might give rise to many vain theories;

as, for example, that Zerubbabel and Joshua had become estranged, and Haggai had espoused the cause of the governor. A simpler explanation, and probably the correct one, is that the prophecy was directed to Zerubbabel because he was the one most concerned in its fulfilment. It begins with a repetition of the announcement of v. [6], *I will shake heaven and earth.*—**22.** In v. [7] the prophet was content with merely indicating in a general way what Yahweh meant by threatening to shake heaven and earth, viz., political commotion. Here he is bolder. *I will overturn,* he makes Yahweh say, *the rule,** lit., *the throne, of the kingdoms, and destroy the might of the nations.* This is a very sweeping prophecy. It seems to mean that the prophet expected the commotion then rife to result in the total abolition of the absolute power exercised by the kings of the earth and their submission to Yahweh as the King of Kings. First, however, there must be great carnage; for Yahweh will overturn *chariots and them that ride therein, and horses shall go down, and their riders,* to Sheol. *Cf.* Is. 5^{14}. It must not be supposed that the Jews are to have any part in this conflict. They will merely be witnesses while Yahweh is destroying their enemies; or rather, while, by his decree, these enemies are destroying one another; for they will fall *each by the sword of his fellow. Cf.* Ju. 7^{22} Ez. 38^{21}.—**23.** The prophet closes this his last discourse with the boldest of all his predictions. He introduces it by a phrase, very common in other books, which, however, he has not hitherto employed. It is *in that day,* by which he means the now rapidly approaching time when the divine plan concerning Israel will be consummated and the Messianic era inaugurated. The solemnity of the announcement is noticeable. The phrase just quoted is followed by a *saith Yahweh of Hosts.* The same expression is used at the end of the verse, while the intervening statements are separated by the briefer *saith Yahweh.* There is only one other passage in the book (v. [4]), in which the prophet appears so anxious to be recognised as a veritable ambassador from the Almighty. Zerubbabel is directly addressed: *I will*

* The word כסא is frequently used in this signification. *Cf.* 1 K. 1^{37}, *et pas.* The rendering above given seems required by parallelism with חוק. Otherwise it might be regarded as an example of a common Heb. idiom, the use of the sg. for the pl. in the cstr. before a pl., and translated *thrones. Cf.* Ges. § 124. 2 (c).

take thee, says Yahweh. The expression implies selection for an important service or mission. Thus, Yahweh "took" Abraham, that he might be the father of a chosen people (Jos. 24^{3}); Israel, that they might be his people and he their God (Ex. 6^{12}); the Levites, that they might serve him at his sanctuary (Nu. 3^{12}); David, that he might be a prince over Israel (2 S. 7^{8}); and Amos, that he might represent him at Bethel (Am. 7^{15}). All these, in so far as they fulfilled the missions for which they were selected, were Yahweh's servants. *Cf.* Gn. 26^{24} Is. 41^{8} 2 S. 3^{18}, etc. Yahweh here calls Zerubbabel, partly in recognition of past faithfulness, but also in anticipation of greater usefulness in the future, his *servant*, and as such promises him unique distinction. *I will make thee as a signet*, he says. Now, the signet, or seal-ring, was not a mere ornament, although as such it was sometimes highly valued by the Hebrews. Its peculiar importance lay in the fact that it was engraved and was used when its owner wished to sign a letter or other document. *Cf.* 1 K. 21^{8}. It represented him, and, since at any time it might be needed for this purpose, he rarely parted with it; but wore it, either on a cord about his neck (Gn. 38^{18}), or on one of the fingers of his right hand (Je. 22^{24}), everywhere. Thus the signet came to be a symbol for one's most precious possession. *Cf.* Je. 22^{24} Ct. 8^{6}. Such is its significance in this connection, as appears from the causal clause, *for thee have I chosen*. There can be no doubt about this statement. It means that Haggai, forgetting the inspiring idea of the Second Isaiah, that Israel had now inherited the promises made to David (Is. 55^{3}), and become the servant ordained to carry the salvation of Yahweh to the ends of the earth (Is. 49^{6}), had revived the doctrine of the ideal king and identified Zerubbabel with the long-expected son of David.

20. On the genuineness of this and the following verses, see p. 30.—חגי] Add, with Kenn. 250 𝔊, הנביא, as elsewhere, exc. vv. $^{13\,f.}$, where it would retard the narrative. *Cf.* 1^{1} $2^{1.\,10}$.—**21.** זרבבל] 𝔊 adds, and doubtless correctly, *τὸν τοῦ Σαλαθιήλ*=בן שאלתיאל].—The words *καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ τὴν ξηράν* (𝔏), at the end of the verse, on the other hand, seem to have been borrowed from v. ^{6}, *q. v.*—**22.** ממלכות] 𝔊, *βασιλέων*. The omission of the art. suggests that perhaps this word was originally followed by העמים; but since the line is already long enough, it is better to supply the art.—ממלכות] Om. with Böh. as unnecessary to the sense and

disturbing to the rhythm. The whole clause is omitted by 𝔊^{ℵ*}, but the omission is evidently due to the carelessness of a copyist, Greek or Heb. —ורכביה] 𝔊^A adds καὶ καταστρέψω πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν καὶ καταβαλῶ τὰ ὅρια αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐνισχύω τοὺς ἐκλεκτούς μου· doubtless a marginal gloss incorporated into its text.—וירדו] Grätz suggests וחררו; van H. וַיֵּרְדוּ. The present reading, however, is easily defensible if the vb. be taken in the natural sense of descending into Sheol which it has in Is. 5^{14} Ez. 32^{19}, etc.—We. supplies יפלו; but, since both the sense and the rhythm are complete without it, it is better to treat the whole clause as a mistaken gloss.—כתוּתָם] Bu. adds לִי; but it is possible that the prophet purposely omitted it, thus avoiding an anthropomorphism to which Je. 22^{24}, saw no objection.

ZECHARIAH AND HIS PROPHECIES.

The book of Zechariah consists of fourteen chapters. The first eight are universally recognised as the work of the prophet to whom they are attributed. The authorship of the last six has long been in dispute, but most recent authorities on the question refer them to some other author or authors. This opinion, the reasons for which will in due time be given, is here taken for granted. The subject of this chapter, therefore, more exactly stated, would be, Zechariah as he reveals himself in the first eight chapters of the book called by his name.

§ 1. THE PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE PROPHET.

There is not much to be learned about Zechariah outside of his prophecies. As in the case of Haggai, the references to him in Ezr. 5^1 6^{14} simply reflect an acquaintance with these utterances in the time of the Chronicler. When, however, Zc. 1^1 is combined with Ne. 12^4 the result is the interesting item of information that Zechariah was a priest as well as a prophet. The fact is so patent that it is not necessary to cite internal evidence in support of it ($3^{7\,\text{ff.}}$), for example, where one might perhaps detect a special interest in the priesthood.* On the other hand, there would be no use in citing $7^{5\,\text{f.}}$ or 8^{19} to the contrary. Any objection based on them would at once be overruled, the answer being that some of the severest criticisms of the priests and the form of religion they represent are by members of their own order. *Cf.* Je. 5^{31} 7^4, etc.

The recognition of Zechariah as a priest, then, is based on his relation to Iddo. But what, precisely, was this relation? According to Zc. 1^1 the former was a grandson of the latter. In Ez. 5^1 and 6^{14}, however, the one is called a son of the other, and this also appears to be the meaning of Ne. 12^{16} compared with v. ^{4}, where

* The casual reader would naturally think 6^{11} more convincing, but, as will be shown in the proper place, it cannot be cited for the purpose named, for the excellent reason that in its present form it does not represent Zechariah, but a sacerdotal reviser. See the comments.

Zechariah takes the place of Iddo among the chief priests under Joiakim the son of Jeshua (Joshua), presumably in the next generation. It has been taken for granted that these discrepant data could be adjusted to one another, and various means to that end have been suggested. A favourite conjecture has been that Zechariah was sometimes called a son of Iddo because Berechiah, who really was his father, was dead or was a person of comparatively little importance. Now, it is true that the word *son* is sometimes in the Old Testament used to denote a descendant of the third or an even later generation. Thus, for example, in Gn. 29^{5} Laban is called the son of Nahor, instead of the son of Bethuel as in 24^{24}, and in Ezr. 7^{1} Ezra is called the son of Seraiah, although there must have been at least three generations between them. *Cf.* 1 Ch. $5^{40\ f.}/6^{14\ f.}$. In the present instance, however, there is a simpler and more reasonable solution of the difficulty. It is found in the fact that the Jews, disregarding chronological considerations, identified Zechariah, the prophet of the Restoration, with the person of the same name mentioned in Is. 8^{2}.* In view of this fact it is more than probable that the Berechiah of Zc. 1^{1} is a corruption of Jeberechiah, the name of the father of Isaiah's associate, and that therefore the phrase "the son of Berechiah" is an interpolation inserted by some one later than the Chronicler who accepted the above identification and took this means of spreading his opinion. The omission of these words makes Zechariah the son of Iddo here, as he is in all the other passages in which he is mentioned.†

Tradition, as represented by Pseudo-Epiphanius, Dorotheus, and Hesychius, has several items with reference to the life of Zechariah which would be interesting if they could be substantiated. Thus, it says that, when he came from Babylon to Palestine, he was already well advanced in years and had given proofs of his prophetic ability by foretelling various future events and performing many miracles.‡ The fact is that these statements are not in harmony with the more credible evidence of the Old Testament, according to which, as already noted, the prophet came to Pales-

* *Cf.* Fürst, *KAT.*, 44 *f.*
† Knobel, *Proph.*, ii, 173 *f.*; Bleek, *SK.*, 1852, 312.
‡ For the text of the accounts of Zechariah by these three writers, see Köhler, 10 *f.*

tine with his father and probably lived until after the death of the high priest Joshua. *Cf.* Ne. $12^{4.16}$. The safer opinion, then, is that Zechariah was a comparatively young man when he came to Palestine, and that he was by no means "advanced in years" when he published his prophecies. He was doubtless younger than Haggai, since he seems to have survived that prophet and to have taken the second place in the movement to restore the temple, his first prophecy being delivered in the eighth month (1^{1}), while Haggai's is dated the first of the sixth, in the second year of Darius. On the other hand, he continued to prophesy some time after his associate had ceased, his last dated utterance being his reply to the men of Bethel in the fourth year of Darius. *Cf.* $7^{1\,ff.}$. In fact Ne. 12^{16}, where he is among the chief priests under Joiakim the son of Joshua, is pretty good evidence that his life was prolonged considerably beyond that date.

The Versions give Zechariah the credit of being a poet as well as a prophet, associating him with Haggai in the authorship of several pieces in the book of Psalms.*

The Christian authors above cited agree in reporting that Zechariah lived to a great age and died a natural death; but one copy of Epiphanius (Cod. Augustanus) says that he was put to death by Joash, king of Judah, in other words, identifies him with Zechariah the son of Jehoida, the story of whose martyrdom is told in 2 Ch. $24^{20\,ff.}$. It seems incredible that any one should make so glaring a mistake, but this is not the only trace of it. The Targum to La. 2^{20} calls the martyred prophet "Zechariah the son of Iddo." Indeed it appears in the New Testament, for when, in Mt. 23^{35}, the Evangelist represents Jesus as using the expression "from the blood of Abel the righteous to the blood of Zechariah the son of Berechiah," he falls into the same error.

There is no escape from this conclusion. In the first place, the text is unassailable, the phrase υἱοῦ Βαραχίου being as clearly genuine as any other part of it. There is only one ms. (א) of importance from which it is wanting, and that had it originally. As for the conjecture that Jehoida was also called Berechiah (Luther), or had a son, the father of Zechariah, of that name

* The Greek Version has his name in the titles of 137 (138) and 145–149 (146–149); the Old Latin in that of 111 (112); the Vulgate in those of 111 (112), 145 *f.* (146 *f.*); and the Syriac in those of 125 *f.* (126 *f.*) and 145–148 (146–148).

(Ebrard, *Krit. der evang. Gesch.*², 422), or that Zechariah the son of Iddo actually suffered the same fate as his unhappy predecessor of the same name, in which many have taken refuge, there is not the slightest foundation for them.

The evangelist is followed, not only by the author of the interpolation in Epiphanius, who quotes from Matthew the phrase "between the temple and the altar," but by Jerome, Chrysostom and many others.* It is clear from the above discussion that nothing is known of the end of Zechariah. The discussion itself, however, by showing that the ancients confounded him with the son of Jehoida, has also given to the conjecture that they also mistook him for the son of Jeberechiah, namely, in Zc. 1^1, increased plausibility.

§ 2. THE STRUCTURE OF CHAPTERS 1–8.

The genuine prophecies of Zechariah form a tolerably consistent and intelligible whole. There is, first, a hortatory introduction (1^{1-6}), originally, to judge from the date prefixed to it, an independent prophecy. The main body of the collection (1^7–6^{23}) naturally falls into two parts, the first of which consists of a series of eight visions, each with its interpretation, followed by a supplementary description of a symbolical act which the prophet is commanded to perform. The second part, chs. 7 *f.*, contains only an account of the mission of the men of Bethel and the oracle that the prophet was instructed to deliver in response to their inquiry, the last paragraph of which furnishes a suitable conclusion for the entire collection.

§ 3. THE TEXT OF CHAPTERS 1–8.

These chapters have suffered much less at the hands of editors, revisers and copyists than the writings of some of the other prophets. Still, it cannot in strictness be said that they have preserved throughout their original form and meaning. There is proof of this at the very outset. It was evidently a habit with Zechariah to introduce his utterances with a statement frequent in the book of Jeremiah, namely, "The word of Yahweh (of Hosts) came to me, saying." At any rate, it can be shown that he used it whenever it was appropriate. Now, however, in certain cases, the first has

* Luke (11^{51}) omits any reference to the parentage of the prophet.

given place to the third person. One of them is in 1^{1}, where the editor of the collection, instead of prefixing a title giving the name, date, etc., of the prophet, and then leaving him to present his own credentials, as did the editor of Jeremiah, has woven a statement of his own into that of his author. In 1^{7} and 7^{1}, on the other hand, where the familiar statement is neither necessary nor appropriate, an imitation of it, with the third person, has been inserted, much to the confusion of the thoughtful reader. In one case (7^{8}) the same sort of a statement has been inserted into the middle of a paragraph, where it separates a formula of citation from the words quoted, the editor being misled by the familiar "Thus saith Yahweh," with which the next verse begins, into supposing that he had reached the beginning of a new prophecy. These changes seem to have been made when the prophecies were added to the collection known as "The Minor Prophets." There are others of a different character, to say nothing of mere mistakes that may have been made at any time since these oracles became public property. Some of them are purely explanatory. A simple example of this class is the clause, *which is the month Shebat*, in 1^{7}. More important is the explanation of the filthy garments with which Joshua was clothed in 3^{4}, and that of the ephah in 5^{6}, both of which are clearly exegetical glosses. There is another class of cases in which the text is expanded by the addition of details or other matter suggested in certain connections. There are a number of examples. See the phrase, *mounted on a bay horse*, in 1^{8}, and the parenthetical clause, *and the spirit was in their wings*, of 5^{9}, but especially in 4^{12} the entirely new feature introduced into the vision of the golden lamp. Finally, there are a few cases in which the changes or additions are of the nature of corrections representing the ideas of the reviser rather than of the original author. See $2^{3}/1^{19}$, where *Israel*, at least, is an interpolation, but especially 6^{10}, where the name of Joshua has been substituted for that of Zerubbabel. These are but specimens. The following table is an attempt to show to what extent the deliberate modification of the text has been carried, also in what degree it has suffered from additions, omissions and distortions through the fault of careless or ignorant transcribers. The reasons in each case will come later.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
1, 1. הנביא—[בן ברכיה]	המלך after לדריוש.	בחרש for באחר לחרש; אל זכריה for אלי.
2. The whole verse.	גדול after קצף.	
3. נאם—צבאות	קרא אל שארית העם הזה at the beginning.	אמר[2] for נאם.
4.	ו before אל; ים[1] from וממעלילים.	
5.		
6.		
7. הוא—שבט היה—לאמר		
8. רכב—אדם		
9.		
10.		
11.		מלאך יהוה for האיש.
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.	צבאות after יהוה[1].	
17.		
$2^1/1^{18}$.		
$2^2/1^{19}$. את ישראל וירושלם	ארני after אלה[1].	
$2^3/1^{20}$.		
$2^4/1^{21}$. להחריד אתם		לאמר for אלי.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
1, 1.	[*Son of Berechiah*] —*prophet.*	*The king* after *Darius.*	*In the eighth month* for *on the first of the eighth month; to Zechariah* for *to me.*
2.	The whole verse.	*very* before *angry.*	
3.	saith—Hosts.[2]	*Call to the remnant of this people,* at the beginning.	*said* for *saith.*
4.		*And* before *be; from* before *your evil deeds.*	
5.			
6.			
7.	*which is the month Shebat; came—saying.*		
8.	*mounted on a bay horse.*		
9.			
10.			
11.			*The angel of Yahweh* for *the man.*
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.		*of Hosts* after *Yahweh.*[1]	
17.			
$^{18}/2^{1}$.			
$^{19}/2^{2}$.	*Israel and Jerusalem.*	*Sir* before *what*	
$^{20}/2^{3}$.			
$^{21}/2^{4}$.	*to discomfit them.*		*saying* for *to me.*

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
$2^4/1^{21}$. קרן		איש for אשר; הנשאים for הנשָׂאים; אל for על.
$2^5/^1$.		
$^6/^2$.	אליו after ויאמר.	
$^7/^3$.		ויצא[1] for נִצָּב.
$^8/^4$.		
$^9/^5$.		
$^{10}/^6$. ו before נסו; כי—יהיה		כארבע for בארבע.
$^{11}/^7$. בת		
$^{12}/^8$. אחר—שלחני	ה before כבוד.	
$^{13}/^9$.		
$^{14}/^{10}$.		
$^{15}/^{11}$.		לי for לו; ושכנתי for ושכן.
$^{16}/^{12}$.		
$^{17}/^{13}$.		
3, 1.	יהוה after ויראני.	
2.	מלאך after ויאמר.	
3.		המלאך for מלאך יהוה.
4. ויאמר—עונך[8]		והלבש אתך for והלבשו אתו.
5. ואמר	טבים after בגדים.	ישימו for וישימו.
6.		
7.		מַהְלְכִים for מַהֲלָכִים.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
$1^{21}/2^{4}$. *horn.*		*a man* for *that; uplifted* for *uplifted themselves; to* for *against.*
$2^{1}/^{5}$.		
$^{2}/^{6}$.	*to him* after *I said.*	
$^{3}/^{7}$.		*was going forth* for *was standing there.*
$^{4}/^{8}$.		
$^{5}/^{9}$.		
$^{6}/^{10}$. *and* before *flee; for—Yahweh.*		*as the four* for *to the four.*
$^{7}/^{11}$. *the daughter of.*		
$^{8}/^{12}$. *after the glory he sent me.*	*the* before *glory.*	
$^{9}/^{13}$.		
$^{10}/^{14}$.		
$^{11}/^{15}$.		*to me* for *to him; I will dwell* for *he will dwell.*
$^{12}/^{16}$.		
$^{13}/^{17}$.		
3, 1.	*Yahweh* before *showed.*	
2.	*the angel of* before *Yahweh.*[1]	
3.		*the angel* for *the angel of Yahweh.*
4. *and he said—thee.*		*and clothed thee* for *and clothe him.*
5. *and I said.*	*goodly* before *garments.*	*let them put* for *and put.*
6.		
7.		In form.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
3, 8. [1]כי : [2]כי—צמח		
9. הנה		
10.		
4, 1.		
2. שבעה		ויאמר for ואמר; וגלה for ונלתה; ושבעה מוצקות for ושבע המוצקות; לנרות for לגלה.
3.		מימין הגלה for מימינה or מימין המנרה.
4.		
5.		
6.		אמר for נאם.
7.		מי אתה הר for כי אתן את ההר(?).
8.		
9.		וידעת for וידעתם.
10.		
11.		
12. The entire verse.	שמן אל גלח after מעליהם.	
13. לאמר		
14.	אלי	
5, 1.		
2.		
3.	בשמי לשקר after הנשבע.	ומזה כמוה[1].[2] for וזה כמה.
4.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
3, 8. *for;*[1] *for*[2]—*Shoot.*		
9. *lo.*[1]		
10.		
4, 1.		
2. *seven.*[2]		*he said* for *I said;* in a form; *seven pipes* for *the seven pipes; the lights* for *the bowl.*
3.		*the bowl* for *it* or *the lamp.*
4.		
5.		
6.		*said* for *saith.*
7.		*Who art thou, mountain,* for *For I will make the mountain* (?).
8.		
9.		*thou shalt,* for *ye shall, know.*
10.		
11.		
12. The entire verse.	*oil* after *discharge; into the* before, and *bowl* after, *golden.*	
13. *saying.*		
14.	*to me* after *said.*	
5, 1.		
2.		
3.	*by my name falsely* after *sweareth.*	*on one side like it* twice for *how long now.*
4.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
5, 5.		
6. [2]ויאמר—הארן ו		עינם for עונם.
7.		
8.		[2]אל for על.
9. ורוח בכנפיהם		
10.		
11.		וְהִנִּיחָה for וְהֻנִּיחָה.
6, 1.		
2.		
3. אמצים		
4.		
5.	אלי הדבר after המלאך; אל after אלה.	
6. אשר בה		[1.2]ויְצאו for יֵצאו.
7.	קדם אל ארץ after יֵצאו.	האמצים for הארמים; יְצאו for יֵצאו.
8. אתי		
9.		
10. ביום—ובאת		לָקוח for לָקַח; מחלדי for את חלדי; ומאת twice for ואת; אתה for אתם; באו for בא.
11. ושמת—הגדול	ה after ושמת.	עטרות for עֲטֶרֶת.
12. [1.2]ולאמר: ומתחתיו—יהוה		אליו for אליהם.
13.		כחאו for ימינו.
14. The entire verse.	ולאשיה.	והעטרת for והעֲטֶרֶת; ולהן for ולהם.
15. והיה—אלהיכם		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
5, 5.			
6.	And he said[2]—land		*their eye* for *their iniquity.*
7.			
8.			*to* for *upon.*
9.	*and the spirit—wings.*		
10.			
11.			*she shall be deposited* for *they shall deposit her.*
6, 1.			
2.			
3.	*strong.*		
4.			
5.		*that was speaking with me* after *angel; to* after *these.*	
6.	*That in which.*		*have gone forth* twice for *shall go forth.*
7.		*to the east country* after *go forth.*	*the strong* for *the bay; have gone forth* for *shall go forth.*
8.	*me* after *called.*		
9.			
10.	*in that day and come.*		In the form of *take; from Helday* for *Helday; from Tobiah* for *Tobiah; from Jedaiah* for *Jedaiah; thou* for *with them; hath* for *have, come.*
11.	*and place—priest.*	*it* after *place.*	*crowns* for *crown.*
12.	*saying* twice; *and upward — Yahweh.*		*to him* for *to them.*
13.			*throne* for *right hand.*
14.	The entire verse.	*and to Josiah.*	*and to Hen* for *even to them.*
15.	*And it shall—God.*		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
7, 1.	היה—זכריה : בכסלו		
2.			וישלח—ואנשיו for וישלחו אנשי ביתאל.
3.	ילאמר	ו before ילאמר.	לבית for בבית; הנזר for הָאנזר.
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			את for אלה.
8.	The entire verse.		
9.	לאמר		
10.		ו before גר.	
11			כנף for כנפם.
12.	ואת דברים : ברוחו		
13.	כן—צבאות		
14.			ואסערם for וְיִסָּעֲרֵם; על for אל.
8, 1.		אלי after צבאות.	
2.		צבאות after ייהוה.	
3.			
4.	ו before איש		
5.			
6.	בימים ההם		
7.			

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
7, 1. *the word—Zechariah; in Kislew.*		
2.		*that Bethel sent Shereser and Regem-melek and his men* for *that the men of Bethel sent.*
3. *saying.*	*and* before *to speak.*	*to* for *in* before *the house; abstaining* for *or abstain.*
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		Sign of acc. for *these* after *are not.*
8. The entire verse.		
9. *saying.*		
10.	*or* before *a stranger.*	
11.		*a back* for *their backs.*
12. *even the words; through his spirit.*		
13. *so shall—Hosts.*		
14.		*I scattered* for *he scattered; upon* for *to* before *all the nations.*
8, 1.	*to me* after *Hosts.*	
2.	*of Hosts* after *Yahweh.*	
3.		
4. *and* before *each.*		
5.		
6. *in those days.*		
7.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
8, 8.			
9.	ההיכל להבנות		
10.			
11.			
12.			זרע for אזרע.
13.	ובית ישראל		
14.	[2]אמר י׳ צ׳		
15.			
16.	[2]אמת		שלום for שָׁלֵם(?).
17.	אשר		
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.	ולבקש—צבאות		
22.			
23.			

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, I–VIII.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
8, 8.		
9. *the temple to be built.*		
10.		
11.		
12.		*seed* for *I will sow.*
13. *and house of Israel.*		
14. *said Yahweh of Hosts.*[1]		
15.		
16. *truth.*[1]		*peaceful* for *perfect* (?).
17. *which.*		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21. *even—Hosts.*		
22.		
23.		

In this connection mention should be made of a case in which a passage has been transferred from one place to another. The passage in question is 4^{7-9} and parts of vv. $^{6 \text{ and } 10}$, which, as will be explained later, seem to belong at the end of ch. 6.

§ 4. THE STYLE OF ZECHARIAH.

The analysis, the results of which have been presented in the foregoing table, was necessary to a correct and defensible opinion with reference to Zechariah as a writer and thinker. Now that it has been made, the next step is the discussion of the literary form of his prophecies. The first fact that strikes one on taking in hand these utterances is that, like those of Haggai, they are all dated. True, in two cases the dates are defective, but this, at least in the first instance, is not the fault of the prophet. There seems to be no reason for doubting the correctness of these dates, which are confirmed by incidental references found in the several prophecies. Thus, in 1^{12} the period during which the Jews have suffered from the indignation of Yahweh is seventy years, probably, as explained in the comments, a round number for the sixty-seven that had actually elapsed since the beginning of the Captivity. See also 4^{9} and 6^{13}, from which it appears that, when these passages were written, work on the second temple had been begun, but the structure had not been completed; and 7^{3}, from which it seems fair to infer that it was nearing completion, as would have been the case in the fourth, if it was finished in the sixth, year of Darius. *Cf.* Ezr. 6^{15}.

It is also noteworthy that the prophecies of Zechariah, unlike those of Haggai, are, or were, all written in the first person. This fact is somewhat obscured by editorial additions, which, however, are easily detected. Thus, it is evident that in 1^{7} and 7^{1} the name and parentage of the prophet are secondary. So also 7^{8} entire. In 8^{1}, on the other hand, *to me* has evidently been omitted. This direct, personal mode of discourse may therefore be regarded as quite as characteristic of Zechariah's style as it is of that of Ezechiel.* It is calculated to excite the interest, and secure the confidence, of the reader.

A more important feature of the prophecies of Zechariah is the number of visions they contain, there being no fewer than eight in the first six chapters. Not that this was by any means a new method of conveying religious instruction. Amos, the oldest of

* In Ez. 1 vv. $^{2-3a}$ have been added, and in v. ^{3b} "upon me" changed to "upon him." Toy, *SBOT*.

the writing prophets, employs them; nor was there a time in the history of the chosen people when they were not more or less popular. *Cf.* Is. 6. Thus the word "vision" actually became a synonym for prophecy. This method of presentation—for it finally became a purely literary device—is found in its most complete development in the book of Ezekiel. It is not Ezekiel, however, from whom Zechariah learned to use visions, but Amos. This is clear from the way in which he uses them, namely, in groups, and for the purpose, not of stimulating in his people great expectations for the future, but of impressing upon them the lessons of the past and the urgent demands of the present. Therefore, much as he taught by visions, it would be a mistake and an injustice to call him a visionary. In fact, there is none of the later prophets who is more sane and practical.

The literary form chosen by Zechariah, in spite of his fondness for visions, is not so poetical as that of most of the other prophets. In fact it is generally that of ordinary Hebrew prose. Now and then, however, especially when he is delivering an express message from Yahweh, he falls into a rhythmical movement, and most frequently that of the second Isaiah. In some cases the rhythmical passage is so short, containing only one or two lines, that it is doubtful if the prophet was conscious of employing the metrical form. In $1^{4\,f.}$ there are two such bits of poetry:

Be not like your fathers, to whom the former prophets cried, saying:
Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts,
Return from your evil ways,
yea, from your evil deeds;
but they did not hear, nor did they listen to me, saith Yahweh.
Your fathers,—where are they?
and the prophets,—do they live forever?

The first of these distichs naturally detaches itself from the context, but the second seems to be a part of the discourse that merely happens to be rhythmical. Like this latter are the parallel clauses in 1^{10} $2^{9/5}$ 4^{7} $8^{12.\,20}$. There are other cases in which the whole passage is rhythmical, or meant to be. Brief specimens of this sort are found in $2^{12/8}$ 8^{2} (distichs) 1^{17} (tristrich) 8^{3} (tetrastich). Those cited from $8^{2\,f.}$ differ, not only in length, but in measure

Moreover, the tetrastich is not as symmetrical in form as it is in content. In $8^{4\ f.}$ the author seems to have abandoned the attempt to be poetical; but a tristich of long lines could be produced by dropping the phrase *playing in the streets* from v. ^{5}. There are three other passages in which he seems to have intended to follow the same measure. They are 1^{14b-15} 3^{7} and 6^{12b-13}. Each of them contains three lines, with a cæsura in the middle. In one passage, $2^{14/10-17/13}$, omitting v. $^{15/11b}$, there are three rather tame tristichs and a final distich. It is thus the longest of the poetical passages noted. The one in $6^{12\ f.}$, however, in its original form is the best example of this form of composition from the hand of the prophet.* There is not, however, sufficient difference in the quality of the last four examples to warrant one in attributing them, or either of them, to any other than Zechariah. Finally, there are not enough of these passages of all kinds and qualities to give him a claim to be called a poet. The speeches in Hebrew prose are frequently cast in a metrical form. *Cf.* Gn. $24^{5.\ 7}$.

Every writer, even the most prosaic, has his favourite forms of expression. Sometimes they are original with himself, but they are often borrowed from other authors. In the former case they become the trade-mark of the originator, distinguishing him from all others; in the latter they may be equally useful for critical purposes. The prophet Zechariah had words, and phrases, and constructions that he preferred to others.

The following are some of them:

The word of Yahweh came (*was*) *to me* is frequent in Jeremiah and Ezechiel. Originally 6 times. *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts* occurs sometimes in Jeremiah, but is comparatively more frequent in Haggai. Here it is used 17 times. In 1^{16} and 8^{3} צבאות (*Hosts*) has wittingly or unwittingly been omitted. *Ye shall* (*thou shalt*) *know that Yahweh of Hosts hath sent me to you* (*thee*). *Cf.* v. $^{15/11}$ 4^{9} 6^{15}. The infinitive לאמר (*saying*) is noticeably frequent in these chapters, occurring 29 times. *The Lord of the whole earth* is used only twice, but not at all in the other prophetical books. The rhetorical question is frequent in Jeremiah and Haggai. Here it is used 11 times. The participle is used in certain constructions; with הנה, 10, without it, 11 times; adverbially, 7 times. Among the words regarded as characteristic of Zechariah's style are: the pronoun of the first person; only in its briefer form, אני; *take pleasure*, בחר, of Yahweh, 3 times, *cf.* Is. 14^{1}; *purpose*, זמם, of Yahweh,

* In all the passages cited, except $2^{14/10\ ff.}$, such expressions as *saith Yahweh* must be neglected as falling outside the metrical scheme.

3 times, *cf.* Je. 4^{28}; ***appease***, חלה, 3 times, *cf.* Je. 26^{19}; ***proclaim***, קרא, 4 times, *cf.* Is. $40^{3.\ 6}$; ***remnant***, שארית, 3 times, *cf.* Hg. 1^{12}; ***return***, שׁב, is used adverbially in the sense of ***again*** 3 times, *cf.* Je. 18^{4}; ***dwell***, שׁכן, of Yahweh, twice, of men once, *cf.* Ex. 29^{45}; ***midst***, תוך, 8 times, *cf.* Hg. 2^{5}. For a fuller list, with some doubtful numbers, see Eckardt, *ZAW.*, 1893, 103 *ff.*

It is clear from the above list that the language of Zechariah cannot be called original. His favourite modes of speech are almost without exception very familiar to the student of the Old Testament. He got them from preceding prophets, being, like Haggai, most indebted to Jeremiah. Indeed, he owes his predecessors more than these characteristic expressions. He himself more than once reminds his people that he is only repeating the message of "the former prophets" to their fathers, 1^{4} $7^{7.\ 12}$ 8^{7}, and his prophecies show that he was acquainted with nearly all the prophetical books and borrowed liberally from several of them.

The following are the passages in which there is evidence of more or less dependence on his predecessors: First there are some in which the prophet reproduces to a greater or less extent the language of others: 1^{4}, *Return from your evil ways, yea, from your evil deeds*, *cf.* Je. 25^{5}. 1^{6}, *As Yahweh of Hosts purposed to do to us, . . . so hath he done with us*, *cf.* La. 2^{17}. 1^{17}, *Yahweh will comfort Zion*, *cf.* Is. 51^{3}. $2^{17/13}$, *Silence, all flesh, before Yahweh! for he hath roused himself from his holy abode*, *cf.* Hb. 2^{20}. 3^{2}, *Is not this a brand plucked from the fire?* *cf.* Am. 4^{11}. 3^{10}, *Under the vine and the fig tree*, *cf.* Mi. 4^{4}. 8^{8}, *They shall be to me a people, and I will be to them a God*, *cf.* Ez. 11^{20} 36^{28} $37^{23.\ 27}$. 8^{12}, *The earth shall yield its produce*, *cf.* Ez. 34^{27}. 8^{14}, *I purposed to do you evil . . . and did not repent*, *cf.* Je. 4^{28}. It is plain from these examples that Zechariah took no pains to reproduce the exact words of earlier writers. There is not a precise quotation among them.

In the passages that remain to be cited he pays still less attention to phraseology. Some of them are merely allusions to previous utterances. 1^{12} he refers to the seventy years of Je. 25^{11}, *cf.* Zc. 7^{5}. 1^{15} the zeal of the nations is condemned as in Is. 47^{6}, *cf.* Is. $10^{\,f.}$. 1^{16} is in substance Is. 47^{28}, but there seems also to be an allusion to Je. $31^{38/39}$. $2^{8/4}$ expands the thought of Je. $31^{38/39}$ and Is. $49^{19\,f.}$; *cf.* also Is. 54^{2}. $2^{9/5}$ seems to have been suggested by Is. 4^{5} and Hg. 1^{8} or 2^{7}. $2^{10/6b}$ is a gloss suggested by Ez. 5^{10}, and $2^{12/8}$, *after the glory he sent me*, is another gloss suggested by Ez. 2^{3}. $2^{13/9}$, on *I will wave my hand*, see Is. 11^{15} 19^{16}. $2^{15/11}$, the phrase, ***many nations***, points to Mi. 4^{2}, *cf.* Is. 2^{3}. $2^{16/12}$, *he will find pleasure in Jerusalem* seems to be an adaptation of Is. 14^{1}. 3^{8}, the reference to the *Shoot* is a gloss, but in 6^{12} there is a genuine one which is evidence of acquaintance with Je. 23^{5}. 4^{6} is a variation on Hg. 2^{5}. 6^{8}, on the idea of assuaging wrath by punishment, see Ez. 5^{13}, etc. $7^{9\,f.}$, the prophet has in mind such passages as Am. 5^{24} Ho. 6^{6} Is. $1^{16\,f.}$ Mi. 6^{8} Je. $7^{5\,ff.}$, for the phrase *true justice*, see Ez. 18^{8}. 7^{11}, *a stubborn shoulder* may be a reminiscence of Ho. 4^{16}, and *stopped their ears* of Is. 6^{10}. 8^{3}, on *the faithful city*, see Is. 1^{16}.

8^{7} is a reminiscence of Is. $43^{5\ f.}$. $8^{9.\ 13}$, on *let your hands be strong*, see Hg. 2^{4}. 8^{10}, a reference to Hg. 1^{6} $2^{16\ f.}$, or the conditions there described. $8^{11\ f.}$, the promise of Hg. $2^{18\ f.}$ is repeated, *cf.* Hg. 1^{10}. 8^{19}, the prophet may well have had in mind Je. $31^{12/13}$. $8^{20\ ff.}$ again recalls Mi. 4^{2}. 8^{23} is another way of putting the thought of Is. 45^{14}.

The number of passages noted does not at first sight seem large, but it must be remembered that chs. 4–6, owing to the character of their content, could not be expected to furnish many. In point of fact, there are but three to represent them. The showing as a whole, therefore, justifies Köhler's remark (25), that "Zechariah got his schooling, not from the culture or religion of the Babylonians, but from the prophets of his own people."

§ 5. THE TEACHING OF ZECHARIAH.

The indebtedness of Zechariah to his predecessors must be recognised, but the extent of this dependence may very easily be overestimated. That he was not a mere plagiarist or imitator is clear from the frankness with which he cites "the former prophets" and the freedom with which he adapts their language to his own taste or purpose. It becomes still clearer when an attempt is made to master the content of his prophecies.

Take first the visions. They were apparently, as has been observed, suggested by those of Amos. They remind one, however, of the elder prophet, not by any similarity in the scenes portrayed, but by the methodical way in which they are handled, the first three, as will be shown, picturing the restoration already partially accomplished, the next two the organisation of the new community, and the last three the removal of sin as a menace to its prosperity, even to its existence. The individual visions differ decidedly from those of Amos, and, indeed, from those of all the other prophets who employ this means of instruction. In the ordinary vision Yahweh appears to his servant and addresses him directly, with or without the aid of symbols. Of the former class are those of Jeremiah, as well as those of Amos. *Cf.* Je. $1^{11\ ff.}$, etc. A good example is the impressive theophany of Is. 6. In Ezekiel, also, Yahweh is sometimes his own interpreter (1^{28}), but in the latter part of the book

an angel, according to Kraetzschmar the angel of Yahweh, appears in the vision and explains his own movements. *Cf.* $40^{3\,f.}$. The visions of Zechariah mark a further development in the same direction. In them also the angel of Yahweh represents the Deity, but there is another angel, described as "the angel that was speaking to me," who takes no part in the action, his sole function being the explanation of what goes forward. This interpreter, who is present in all the visions, and speaks in all but the fourth ($3^{1\,ff.}$), is original, so far as can be determined, with Zechariah.

The interpreter is only one of many angels who appear in the visions. In the first there are the messengers who report on the condition of the earth (1^{12}); in the fourth the attendants of the angel of Yahweh (3^{4}); and in the others additional members of the heavenly host, each with his peculiar functions. Not even in the book of Daniel are these celestial beings so constantly in evidence. In fact, they constitute an order of intermediaries between a transcendent Deity and his mundane creatures, and, as such, are constantly employed in the execution of the divine will. Among them, in the fourth vision, appears the Adversary, a being of like rank but of very different character. He, also, is a feature of Zechariah's prophecies, being, in fact, found here for the first and only time in the prophetical literature. On the development of the idea that he represents, see the comments.

There is another feature of these visions that deserves attention: there is nothing intentionally mysterious or enigmatical about them. The prophet does not hesitate here, as elsewhere, to mention names. Thus, in the fourth (3^{8}) Joshua is expressly named, and in the fifth (4^{14}) the only reason why both Zerubbabel and Joshua are not named is that it is perfectly clear from other passages who are meant. In thus dealing openly with the men and events of his own time Zechariah follows the example of the earlier prophets and differs from some other biblical authors.

In the direct teaching of Zechariah there is nothing very surprising. Indeed, perhaps the most noticeable thing about it, as a whole, is its simplicity and sobriety: which is equivalent to saying that the prophet, though not as great as some of his predecessors, was well adapted for the task to which he believed himself com-

missioned. It was a day of small things. In such circumstances some would have been provoked to extravagance, as if it were a virtue to look for that which there are no grounds for expecting. He looked for greater and better things, but he did not allow himself or his people to expect them to come over night, or remain, except on very prosaic conditions, and it was his sobriety that fitted him for leadership during the Restoration.

His sobriety is seen in the modesty of the dimensions he assigns to the restored kingdom. There is no mention of Israel or the territory once occupied by the Ten Tribes, for, although the name appears twice ($2^2/1^{19}$) in the Massoretic text, in both cases it is clearly an interpolation. He seems, therefore, to have thought of this kingdom as about coterminous with the former kingdom of Judah. He saw room enough there, however, for Jerusalem to expand into a great city, to which "many peoples and mighty nations" would come to worship the true God. *Cf.* 8^{22}.

Zechariah follows Haggai in recognising Zerubbabel as the Messiah and the restorer of the Davidic dynasty. He differs from his associate, however, in his treatment of Joshua. Haggai seems disposed to exalt Zerubbabel at the expense of the high priest, while Zechariah assigns to the latter a position and dignity little less than royal; for although, as will be explained, it is Zerubbabel who, in 6^{13}, is to "receive majesty and sit and rule on his throne," Joshua will occupy a place "at his right hand." This concession was required by the increased importance of the priesthood after the Exile, but it is one which, to judge from the general tenor of his prophecies, Zechariah would have made, even if he himself had not belonged to the sacerdotal order.

The good time coming is described by some of the prophets in the most extravagant terms. One of them in Is. 65^{20} promises that then every one will live at least a hundred years. There is nothing of this kind in Zechariah's prophecies. There are old men and women in his picture of the future, but they are as natural and recognisable as his "boys and girls playing in the streets." *Cf.* $8^{4\,f.}$. Their happiness, too, is perfectly intelligible. "The vine shall yield its fruit, and the earth shall yield its produce, and heaven shall grant its dew." *Cf.* 8^{12}. Why, then, should not "the house

of Judah" even change the fasts of the Exile into occasions of "joy and gladness, even pleasant feasts"? *Cf.* 8^{19}.

Enough has already been said on the subject of Zechariah's teaching to show that, in spite of his fondness for visions, he is not to be classed with the apocalyptists of the Old Testament. There is further evidence to the same effect. It is found in his constant regard for, and emphasis on, ethical considerations. He, unlike Haggai, makes them prominent from the start; for, in his introductory message, he tells his people bluntly that their fathers suffered for their sins and that they themselves will be held strictly accountable for their conduct. He announces the basal doctrine of his prophecies as well as a fundamental principle of the divine government when he says, "Return unto me, saith Yahweh of Hosts, and I will return unto you."

This doctrine underlies the last three visions, the first of which teaches that, although Yahweh may not again punish his people by wholesale banishment from their country, he will see to it that the individual sinner gets his deserts. In the second the thought is that Yahweh will not tolerate a rival in his own land, and in the third that the ultimate fate of such rivals, wherever worshipped, is destruction.

One point more. It concerns the ethical precepts that Zechariah lays down in the last chapter. They are not by any means new. "The former prophets" also taught them. It is interesting, however, to compare those here taught with those which Zechariah in $7^{9\,f.}$ attributes to his predecessors. The difference is doubtless to some extent due to changed circumstances. The Persian government, in spite of its remoteness, seems to have been able to prevent the cruelty to widows and orphans and strangers of which the earlier prophets complained. Be that as it may, the emphasis is here placed on loyalty to truth and simple justice. In 8^{19} he comprehends all duty in the brief maxim, "Love truth and peace," a maxim in perfect harmony with his ideal of the future, when, as he says in 3^{10}, his people, blessed with perfect peace and unity, will "invite every man his neighbour under the vine and the fig tree."

The primary object of the above discussion was to prepare the

reader for the sympathetic and appreciative study of the prophecies universally attributed to Zechariah; but it is evident that it will serve the further purpose of providing the basis for a comparison between them and those whose genuineness is questioned in the Introduction to the last six chapters of the book called by his name.

COMMENTARY ON THE PROPHECIES OF ZECHARIAH.

The book of Zechariah has no proper title, but the first verse contains, in addition to the date of the opening prophecy, the substance of such a title. If it had been fully and definitely expressed, it would probably have taken the form of that of the book of Joel, namely, *The word of Yahweh, which came to Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo, the prophet.* In that case, however, the first verse would have been, in part (*the word of Yahweh was to*), a repetition of the title. This is probably the reason why the editor by whom the author of the book was identified chose to insert the name and pedigree of the prophet into the first verse and thus make it answer the purpose of a general title as well as a date for the introductory prophecy. The fact that the verse actually serves this double purpose makes it proper to discuss further some features of it in this preliminary paragraph. The most important is the name of the prophet. This name, meaning *Yahweh remembereth*,* is of frequent occurrence in the Old Testament. According to the Chronicler it was borne by at least five persons belonging to the time of David,† but, since there are only two other names of the same form mentioned in the earlier literature,‡ it is not probable that this one is much older than the date of its first appearance in the latter half of the eighth century B. C.§ From that time onward, however, like the rest of its class, it became increasingly common, especially among the priests and Levites. Indeed it seems to have been the prime favourite among the names of the Old Testament,

* For a discussion of rejected etymologies, see Köhler, 1 *ff*.

† *Cf.* 1 Ch. 15^{18} 24^{25} $26^{2.\,11}$ 27^{21}. So Gray, *HPN.*, 288. McPherson (*DB.*) distinguishes seven so designated in this early period. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 9^{37} 15^{4}.

‡ Benaiah, 2 S. 8^{18}, and Shephatiah, 2 S. 3^{4}.

§ *Cf.* Is. 8^{2}; also 2 K. 14^{9} 18^{2}. There is another related class of names, that in which the pf. of a verb is preceded, instead of being followed, by יה or יהו, examples of which occur in the earliest Hebrew records. *Cf.* Jehoiada (2 S. 8^{18}), Jonathan (Ju. 8^{20}), etc. These disappear as the others increase in frequency. *Cf.* Gray, *HPN.*, 176 *f*.

being borne by no fewer than twenty-nine different persons.* The identity, personal history and the literary characteristics of the one here meant have already been discussed in the Introduction. It is hardly necessary to add that it is he, and not his father or grandfather, who is here described as *the prophet*.

The Title.—**1.** The reasons for believing that the verse has been recast are as follows: One of the peculiarities of these chapters is the use of the first person. It appears repeatedly in the introductory formula, *Then came the word of Yahweh to me.* *Cf.* 6^{9} 7^{4} $8^{1.18}$. In 1^{7} and $7^{4.8}$, as will be shown, it is an interpolation. In this case, therefore, it is fair to suppose that the original reading was אלי, and that the name and lineage of the prophet were substituted for the pronominal suffix. This is a simpler and more natural explanation than to suppose, with Bu. (*ZAW.*, 1906, 5 *f.*), that a once independent title has been absorbed in the first verse. *Cf.* Ez. $1^{2f.}$, where a less skilful hand has attempted the same thing and made a botch of it.—ברכיה] Sometimes ב׳; v. ^{7} ברכיהו. The impossibility of harmonising this passage with Ezr. 5^{1} 6^{14} Ne. 12^{16}, as explained in the Introduction, makes it necessary to attribute the phrase בן ברכיהו to a careless reader who identified the prophet of the Restoration with the Zechariah of Is. 8^{2}.—עדו] Elsewhere in Heb. (v. ^{7} Ne. $12^{4.16}$), as well as Aram. (Ezr. 5^{1} 6^{14}), עדוא; here also, according to 19 Kenn. mss. The form here found, however, is used of other persons (1 Ch. 6^{6} 2 Ch. 12^{15} 13^{22}). 𝔊 has υἱὸν Ἀδδὼ; Jer. *filium Addo.* Lowe explains υἱὸν as a scribal error for υἱοῦ; but perhaps τοῦ βαραχίου is a correction based on the gloss בן ברכיה; in which case υἱὸν must have been the original reading.—הנביא] Om. 𝔖^{A}. The Mas. are responsible for the identification of *the prophet* with Iddo, since they accented the text so that it could not be interpreted otherwise.

The contents of these eight chapters, as already intimated, naturally fall into three parts. 1. The introduction (1^{1-6}). 2. A series of visions, with their interpretations (1^{7}–6^{15}). 3. A new era (7–8).

1. THE INTRODUCTION (1^{1-6}).

It consists of an exhortation backed by a reminder of the past experience of the Jews, the result of their disregard for the warnings of former prophets.

* The popularity of the name is equally evident, even if it is sometimes applied by the Chronicler to imaginary persons, for he would not have used it so frequently if it had not been very common in his generation. *Cf.* Gray, *HPN.*, 188 *f.*

1. This introduction, like the main divisions by which it is followed, has a date. The date here found, however, differs from the other two in being incomplete; for, while the year and the month are given, the day is wanting. It may have been omitted intentionally, as in Ezr. 3^{8} 7^{8} and elsewhere; but the more common opinion is, either that it is implied in the word rendered *month*, חדש, which is sometimes, for example, 2 S. $20^{5\,ff.}$, properly translated *new moon*, or that it has been lost in the process of transcription. The former of these views, though adopted by Kimchi and other scholars, must be rejected as being entirely without real foundation in Hebrew usage. On the other hand there are repeated examples showing that the first as well as the other days of the month was indicated by a distinct number. *Cf.* Gn. 8^{5} Hg. 1^{1}, etc. If, therefore, Zechariah intended to say, as the Syriac Version says he did, that this opening prophecy was delivered *on the first day of the eighth month*, the month originally called Bul (1 K. 6^{38}), but later Marchesvan, the word or words indicating the day must have been lost in transmission. So We., Now., Marti, Kit. Haggai's first prophecy is dated the first of the sixth month *in the second year of* the reign of *Darius* Hystaspes. If, therefore, the Syrian reading is correct, Zechariah began his prophetic career just two months later, namely, about the middle of October, 520 B.C. In any case it was not three months before this his first prophecy was delivered. In recording it he did not, as is done in the present text, use the third person, but, as has been shown, the first, so that the latter half of this verse should read, *came the word of Yahweh to me, saying.**

2. The reading suggested is not favoured by the immediate context. If Zechariah actually used the language just attributed to him, in this second verse Yahweh should be the speaker and the prophet the person addressed. This is not the case, the statement made being made, not by, but about, the Almighty, and addressed apparently to the people. It will not, however, do to reject the proposed reading on that account, as appears when one passes from this verse to the one following. It then becomes clear, not

* *Cf.* 6^{9} 7^{4} $8^{1.\,18}$. On the passages that do not follow this formula (1^{7} and $7^{1.\,8}$), see the corresponding notes and comments.

only that there is no connection between the two, but that v. ^{3} has precisely the form that this one should have taken. The natural inference is that the statement *Yahweh was very wroth with your fathers* is an interpolation. It is not so easy to explain why it should have been inserted. Perhaps a copyist, finding the text defective, supplied the place of the missing words as well as he could from 7^{12}, where the prophet refers to the wrath of Yahweh against the fathers.

3. In AV. this verse begins with *Therefore say*, etc., this being the only way in which the present text can well be rendered; but so rendered it can hardly convey the thought that the prophet had in mind. He would not have represented Yahweh as commanding him to deliver the message that follows, a message requiring his people to return to him, because he (Yahweh) had been wroth with their fathers. Nor is the connection improved by the omission of v. ^{2}; for the statement *the word of Yahweh came to me* contains no reason for the command given. It must have had its ground in something that Yahweh himself had previously said. The same result is reached if the connective is translated literally *and*. In other words, as has already been intimated, the text here lacks several words, which must be supplied to make it completely intelligible. In the first place, there must have been at least one preceding verb having the sense of *speak*, or perhaps, as Budde suggests, *cry* (preach), a favourite with Zechariah (vv. $^{4.\ 14.\ 17}$ 7^{7}); and this, if the present text, so far as it has been preserved, is correct, must have been followed by an indirect object, perhaps *this people* or *the remnant of this people* ($8^{6.\ 11.\ 12}$), the antecedent of the pronoun *them*. The original reading would thus be, *Preach (cry) to the remnant of this people and say to them*, or something equivalent, which would appropriately follow the statement of v. ^{1} and introduce the message he has to deliver, *Return to me, and I will return to you, saith Yahweh*. It does not at once appear what is meant by this message, in what respect the people have departed from God and how they should return to him. The fact that the prophecy is dated a little after the appeal by which Haggai, with the aid of the Spirit, brought the Jews to undertake the restoration of the temple, would lead one to expect such an arraignment for

selfish absorption in private affairs as is found at the beginning of the preceding book. *Cf.* Hg. $1^{4.\ 9}$. It appears, however, from what immediately follows (v. [4]), but more clearly from later utterances ($7^{8\ f.}$ $8^{16\ f.\ 19}$), that, to Zechariah, although he himself was a priest, a temple was not the only, or the greatest, need from which his people were suffering; nor was its splendour his measure for their future welfare. Here, therefore, the return to Yahweh must be interpreted, not merely as the restoration of the national worship at Jerusalem, but as the resumption of the practice of the social virtues, justice, mercy, and the like, on which the main stress was laid by the earlier prophets. *Cf.* Am. $5^{15.\ 24}$ Is. 1^{17}, etc. The promise by which the people are encouraged to return to Yahweh must be interpreted to correspond to the exhortation; not, therefore, as a means of exciting visions of material splendour, but of wakening an expectation of universal well-being in a divinely ordered community. *Cf.* 8^{8}.

4. Yahweh, not content with taking the first step toward a reunion between himself and his people, next seeks, in the most persuasive terms, to show them the folly of rejecting his overtures. *Be not*, he pleads, *as your fathers*, and then proceeds to describe those whose example he wishes to prevent them from following. They, also, were wanderers from Yahweh, and Yahweh sought them. His agents were *the former prophets*. It is possible to interpret these words too broadly. There would be an apparent warrant for so doing if v. [19] were throughout genuine. It is not, the name "Israel" in that passage, like "the house of Israel" in 8^{13}, being without doubt an interpolation. The correction of the text in these two passages leaves the prophecies of Zechariah without recognisable allusions to the northern kingdom. It is Judah and Jerusalem over whose past he grieves ($1^{12.\ 21}$) and for whose future he cares. *Cf.* 2^{12} 8^{19}. The prophets to whom he refers must, therefore, be those who laboured in Judah, especially those of the closing years of the Jewish monarchy. It was their preaching whose burden was, *Return from your evil ways, yea, from your evil deeds.* He seems to have had more particularly in mind Jeremiah, who several times uses almost exactly the language here quoted. In $25^{4\ f.}$ the setting also is the same. The passage reads,

"And he sent to you all his servants the prophets, sent them early, —but ye did not hear, neither did ye incline your ears to listen,— saying, Return, each from his evil way and from the evil of his deeds, and dwell on the soil that Yahweh gave to you and your fathers for ever and ever." *Cf.* also 35[15]. Less exact parallels are found in 18[1] and Ez. 33[11]. The remaining words of this verse, too, were evidently borrowed from Jeremiah, but they are here applied to Jeremiah's own generation rather than to any that had preceded it. *Cf.* especially 36[9 ff.].—**5.** One naturally expects the prophet's characterisation of the fathers to be followed immediately by a description more or less vivid of the fate that their flagrant and incorrigible neglect of Yahweh brought upon them; and at first this verse seems to answer that expectation. *Your fathers*, he says, as if he were about to make a statement concerning them, then suddenly changes the construction and asks, with a brevity that is very dramatic, *where are they?* This question reminds one of Is. 51[13], "When he taketh his aim to destroy,—where is the fury of the oppressor?" the author of which, as appears from the next verse, meant to convey the idea that the oppressors of the exiled Jews would themselves speedily be swept out of existence. A similar interpretation in this case would suit the preceding context and accord with the facts of history. It was therefore adopted by some of the earlier commentators, Jewish and Christian.* It is forbidden by the latter half of the verse, *and the prophets,—do they live forever?* for it is incredible that Zechariah would have represented Yahweh as destroying his messengers with those who ignored their message. Jerome attempted to meet this objection by identifying the prophets here meant with the false prophets, who played an important part in the later history of the kingdom of Judah; but it is clear that in the preceding and following verses they are the predecessors of Zechariah, and the connection requires that the term here have the same meaning. *Cf.* also 7[7. 12]. Nor is it necessary, as in the Targum,† to put the second question into the mouths of the people. The two can be harmonised by supposing that the prophet is here thinking of the fathers and the prophets as merely two classes of men, alike mortal, in comparison with Yah-

* So Theod. Mops., Dru., Marck. † So also van Hoonacker.

weh and his eternal purposes.—**6.** The contrast in the mind of the prophet is strongly expressed by the adversative *But*, with which this verse begins. It is not a contrast between men and God, but between men and the *words* and *decrees*, or the words as embodied in the decrees, of Yahweh promulgated through his *servants the prophets*. The words of Yahweh seem to be personified here, as is "the word of Yahweh" in other parts of the Old Testament. Thus, Ps. 147^{15} reads, "He sendeth his command upon earth; swiftly runneth his word." A more significant example is found in Is. 55^{11}, where the great prophet of the Exile puts into the mouth of the Deity these words:

> So shall it be with my word,
> that goeth forth from my mouth:
> It shall not return to me empty;
> nor until it hath done what I willed,
> and prospered in that for which I sent it.

Zechariah pictures these punitive decrees of Yahweh as intelligent agents, like the angels, sent forth to execute upon offenders the decisions of the divine will. *Cf.* 5^{4}.* At any rate, with another of his rhetorical questions he asks, *did they not overtake your fathers?* referring, of course, to the calamities, repeatedly predicted by Jeremiah and others, which befell the Jews in the overthrow of their government and the banishment of the better classes of the country to Babylonia. Here, having reached a climax, he might have stopped. Indeed, it is only so far that the conduct of the fathers is reprehensible, and therefore not to be imitated. The rest of the verse, however, has its justification. It adds an item, *then they returned*, which enlarges the scope of the narrative, thereby giving it the character of a positive rather than a negative lesson. Nor is this all. The words put into the mouths of the fathers are at the same time an evidence of a changed attitude toward Yahweh and a vindication of Yahweh himself as a God of truth and the prophets as his messengers. This is their testimony: *As Yahweh of Hosts purposed to do to us, according to our ways and according to our deeds, so hath he done with us.* It is calculated to produce

* *Cf.* Piepenbring, *Theol.*, 250; cp. Dillmann, *Theol.*, 345 *f.*

the conviction that, as Theodoret of Mopsuestia puts it, "the truth of the divine words is beyond question, and these words cannot be neglected with impunity."

1. 𝔖 inserts after the number of the month ܒܚܕ ܒܝܪܚܐ = באחר לחדש. This is an allowable arrangement, being actually found in 2 K. 25^{8}; but if it had been that of the original text, the missing phrase would hardly have been lost. On the other hand, it is comparatively easy to account for the present text on the supposition that the day preceded the month here as well as in v. ^{7}. The first word of a Hebrew book is easily overlooked. In this case the loss of באחר would make it necessary to change לחדש to בחדש to render it intelligible.—לדריוש] Add as in 7^{1} Hg. $1^{1.15}$, with 𝔐, המלך.—**2.** Bu. attempts to save this verse by removing it to the next and inserting it before שבו, at the same time changing קצף י׳ to קצפתי; but the result of such an emendation would not be satisfactory; for the troublesome clause would be almost as difficult to construe with v. ^{3} as in its present position, while the lacuna at the beginning of that verse would be more apparent than it now is.—קצף] Add with 𝔊 𝔖, גדול. On the construction, *cf.* Ges. $^{§\,117.\,3.\,R.\,4}$.—**3.** ואמרת] The pf. of אמר with ו implies a preceding declarative, like דבר or קרא in the imv. The Heb. of the clause supplied in the comments, קרא אל שארית העם הזה, would just fill the space now occupied by v. ^{3}. Blayney suggests (לאמר) אמר אל כל עם הארץ, as in 7^{5}.—אלהם] For אליהם, the reading of many mss.—נאם י׳ צ׳] Om. with 𝔊$^{N c. a. Q}$ 𝔊^{H} 𝔖^{H}.—נאם] Not a prtc., but a noun. *Cf.* BDB. Acc. to Kö. $^{II.\,§\,130.\,d}$ the vocalisation (ְ) is due either to a virtually doubled ם or the frequency of the word in a familiar expression. The latter is evidently the more reasonable supposition.—ואשוב] Without ה, acc. to Bö. $^{§\,964\,g}$, on acct. of a following guttural. This explanation is mistaken, since, in all other cases (6), the word takes ה, even before a guttural. *Cf.* Ex. 4^{18} Ho. 2^{9} Mal. 3^{7}.—אמר^{3}] The rarity of this word as a substitute for נאם has already been noted. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{8}. It occurs only three times in these chapters, and in one at least of them (7^{13}) it is a part of an interpolation. It is therefore possible that Kenn. 249, which has נאם, has preserved the original reading. Kenn. 150 has both, as if it had been corrected.—צבאות^{3}] Om. 𝔊^{H} 𝔖^{H}.—**4.** אַל] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, ואל.—מעליליכם] Acc. to BDB., pl., of מעליל; acc. to Köh., Ke., Wri., irr. pl. of עלילה. Qr. מַעַלְלֵיכֶם. So 32 Kenn. mss., Hi., Lowe, *et al.* Rd., with 21 mss., 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗, מִמַּעַלְלֵיכֶם. *Cf.* Baer (Notes, 81), We., Now., Marti, Kit.—ולא שמעו] 𝔊^{NB}, *καὶ οὐκ εἰσήκουσαν*, which, since שמעו is represented in the final clause, *καὶ οὐ προσέσχον τοῦ εἰσηκοῦσαί μου*, is probably a duplicate rendering. Hence it is not strange that in 𝔊^{AQL} it should be wanting. *Cf.* 7^{11} (𝔊).—For הקשיבו אלי 𝔖^{L} has ܢܨܘܬܘܢ by mistake for ܢܨܠܘܢ.—𝔖^{A} read צבאות at the

end of the verse.—**5.** In 𝕾, and sometimes in 𝔊, both subjects are included in the first question; so also, in Jerome's commentary, in his translations from the Greek and the Heb. Such a division of the verse, however, does violence, not only to the accentuation, but to the symmetry of the passage.—והנבאים] 𝕾 ܘܢܒܝܐ = ונביאי.—**6.** אך] An adversative, *cf.* Gn. 20^{12} 1 S. 29^{9}.—וחקי] 𝔊 supplies *δέχεσθε*, which, however, may be a mistaken rendering for וחקי, taken for חקוּ, *καὶ τὰ νόμιμά μου* being a later correction.—צויתי. 𝔊 adds *ἐν πνεύματί μου* = ברוחי, after the manner of 𝔗.—Accent, not, with Gins., ויאמרו—לנו, but, with Baer, according to the sense, לנו . . . ויאמרו.

2. A SERIES OF VISIONS, WITH THEIR INTERPRETATIONS (1^{7}–6^{15}).

There are eight of these visions. Some of them are described very briefly, others with considerable detail. They are not all equally distinct from one another, but fall into three groups, as follows: the first three, depicting The return from captivity (1^{7}–$2^{17/13}$); the fourth and fifth, of which the theme is The anointed of Yahweh (chs. 3 *f.*, exc. $4^{6ab-10a}$); and the last three, which may be grouped under the general heading, The seat of wickedness (5^{1}–6^{8}). They are supplemented by a section on The prince of Judah (6^{9-15} $4^{6a\beta-10a}$).

a. The Return from Captivity (1^{7}–$2^{17/13}$).

The visions of the first group, three in number, present successive stages in the history of the Restoration and prepare the way for an appeal with which the section closes. In the first vision the scene is laid in

(1) THE HOLLOW OF THE MYRTLES (1^{7-17}).

In this vision the prophet sees a person to whom a troop of divinely commissioned messengers report, thus furnishing an occasion for an appeal to Yahweh in behalf of his people and a response assuring them of speedy deliverance.

7. To this vision is prefixed a date, doubtless, as is generally admitted, the date of the entire series. The prophet saw these visions in the same (Jewish) year in which he uttered the preceding

prophecy, *the second year* of the reign *of Darius* Hystaspes, in *the eleventh month*, and, since the day began in the evening, the night before *the twenty-fourth day* of the month, or toward the middle of February in the year 519 B.C.

In this case some one has added the Babylonian name, *Shebat*, to the number of the month. On the names of the rest of the months, *cf.* Benzinger, *Arch.*, 200 *f.*; *DB.*, art. *Time*. Six more of these names occur in this and other late books: Nisan, the first (Ne. 2^{1}); Sivan, the third (Ezr. 8^{9}); Elul, the sixth (Ne. 6^{15}); Kislew, the ninth (Zc. 7^{1}); Tebeth, the tenth (Ezr. 2^{16}); and Adar, the twelfth (Ezr. 6^{15}).

Köh. is disposed to think that the appearance of these visions on the twenty-fourth of the month was a recognition by Yahweh of the devotion of his people in beginning work on the temple on the twenty-fourth of the sixth, and laying the foundation of the new structure on the same day of the ninth month. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{15} 2^{10}. Too much, however, should not be made of this coincidence, lest some one should make the point that it stamps the chronology of the books of Haggai and Zechariah as artificial and unreliable. It should also be remembered that, as was shown in the comments on Hg. 2^{18}, it is by no means certain that the foundation of the new temple was laid on the twenty-fourth of the ninth month.

Dru. justly criticises Jerome for saying that the month Shebat was "*in acerrimo tempore hyemis*"; for, although in February the rainy season is not yet ended, the weather is often very warm and pleasant and other tokens of spring are abundant.

This date, in the Massoretic text, is immediately followed by the introductory clause found in v.[1], *the word of Yahweh came to Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, the son of Iddo, saying.* In this case, however, it is not enough to recast it, substituting the first for the third person. The result, to be sure, would be a formula in the style of Zechariah, but one that would here be as useless as that for which it was substituted; for it also, if fairly and naturally interpreted,* would give the reader the impression that it was Yahweh who saw the vision to be described, which surely was not the thought of the original author. The only remedy is in dropping the disturbing clause altogether and connecting v. [8] directly with the date of the vision, as is done in Is. 6^{1}.†—**8.** On the given date Zechariah says he *saw* certain things. The word used‡ is the one

* *Cf.* $8^{2.3.7.14}$.

† If Neumann had done this, it would not have been necessary for him to devote a long paragraph to explaining how a vision can be called "the word of Yahweh."

‡ ראה.

commonly employed to denote perception by means of the organs of vision. A literalist might regard this fact as a warrant for holding that the things and acts described presented themselves as objects to the physical senses; but there are features of this vision that are inconsistent with its objective reality, and, when the attempt is made to explain the whole series as literal scenes, the inadequacy of that method of interpretation becomes increasingly apparent. Note the angels mounted on horses in this, and the various symbolic objects or actions in the other pictures, especially the fantastic figure of the woman in the ephah. *Cf.* 5^7. It is impossible also, in spite of the fact that Zechariah says the time was *at night*, to maintain that he saw the things described in his sleep. A sufficient reason for this assertion is found in the fact that he not only does not say, but apparently takes pains not to say, that he was dreaming. Even if it were necessary to admit that he intended to represent his visions as inspired dreams, the ease with which he passes from the language of the vision to that of ordinary prophetic discourse would dispel the illusion.* There are considerations, also, that make it improbable that these visions were produced in an ecstatic condition by the direct influence of the divine spirit† or under the stimulus of an intense and overpowering conviction. There are too many of them, and they too clearly betray forethought and invention. They must, therefore, be classed, with those of Am. $7^{1\,ff.}$ Je. $1^{11\,ff.}$ and Ez. $8^{ff.}$, as literary forms in which the prophet clothed his ideas, whatever their origin, for the purpose of securing for them prompter attention among those whom he sought to instruct and influence. It is only just to add that, as will appear in the course of these comments, for attractiveness and effectiveness the visions of Zechariah fall below the average of those used by his predecessors. The first is rather obscure, but, as the scene is laid in the night, the indistinctness of the various figures introduced seems natural, if not intentional. Among these figures the first to appear is *a man*. Who the man is, Zechariah

* Köh. cites Ew. and Hi. as holding the view that the prophet is reporting a succession of dreams. Hi. in his commentary is rather ambiguous. Ew., although he refers to the visions as "*Traumgebilde*," adds that they are not really dreams, much as they resemble them, but that they were devised in their order for a deliberate purpose.

† So Köh., Ke., Wri., Or., *et al.*

does not explain, but the reader at once suspects that he, like the man in Ez. 8^2* $40^{3\,ff.}$, etc., is a superhuman being, and therefore is not surprised to find that in a gloss to v. [11] he is identified with "the angel of Yahweh." This view has been questioned,† but it is a natural inference from the language used, and, as the evident superiority of the person whose identity is in question over all the others mentioned points in the same direction, it has been widely accepted.‡ On the title "angel of Yahweh," *cf.* Hg. 1^{13} and the comments. In this book it evidently denotes a visible manifestation of Yahweh. He is described, in a gloss which seems to have been added by some one who thought it beneath the dignity of the angel of the divine presence to be on foot while his attendants were on horseback, as ***mounted on a bay horse,***§ but in a genuine clause as ***standing,*** or better, in the present connection, ***waiting, among the myrtles.***

The myrtle (*Myrtus communis*) is not, as one would suppose from the English rendering of Is. 55^{13}, a tree, but a shrub that seldom attains a height of more than eight feet. It is an evergreen, with fragrant leaves and delicate white flowers. It was a favourite among the Hebrews. Hence it is mentioned among the trees that testify to the prosperity of the Messianic age. *Cf.* Is. 41^{19} 55^{13}. From it, as from the palm and other trees, they cut branches to make booths for the Feast of Tabernacles. *Cf.* Ne. 8^{15}. In Lv. 23^{40} the willow takes the places of both the myrtle and the olive; a fact which favours the opinion that much of the priestly legislation took its final shape outside of Palestine. The myrtle is still common throughout Palestine, growing wild on the slopes of the hills and along the water-courses (*cf.* Vergil, *Georg.*, ii, 122; iv, 124), as well as in the gardens of the inhabitants. *Cf. DB.*, art. *Myrtle;* Tristram, *NHP.*, 365 *f.*

The myrtles the prophet has in mind are in a locality especially favourable to their growth, ***a hollow.*** This depression has been

* In this passage the correct reading is not "the appearance of fire" (אֵשׁ), but "the appearance of a man" (אִישׁ). *Cf.* Toy, *SBOT.*

† Köh., Ke., Klie., Wri., Now., *et al.*

‡ So Ra., AE., Cal., Dru., Marck, Lowth, Bla., Ew., Hd., Pres., Or., Reu., *et al.* Some of these at the same time hold that the man is the son of God. This doctrine was widely current among the earlier commentators, but it did not pass unchallenged. Theodoret of Mopsuestia says in criticism of it, "Full of error and folly, nay, little short of impiety, is the teaching by some that he saw the son of God"; and again, in a passage that seems to have been mutilated by a more orthodox reader, he declares, "None of the prophets knew anything about the deity of the Only Begotten."

§ The word rendered *bay* (אָדֹם) is used of various shades of colour from pink to reddish-brown. *Cf.* Ct. 5^{10} 2 K. 3^{22} Nu. 19^2 Is. 63^2 Gn. 25^{30}. 25.

identified with the Valley of Kidron, and that part of it about its junction with the Valley of Hinnom; and there is something to be said for this opinion: (1) This spot is the lowest near the city, and therefore most likely to be called "The Hollow." (2) It has always been a garden, being the site of "The King's Garden" of 2 K. 25^4, and even in Zechariah's time the myrtle must have flourished there. (3) If, as some claim, the setting of the last vision ($6^{1 ff.}$) is the same as that of the first, this circumstance also is significant, for there is no other locality near Jerusalem that would so well suit both cases. Since, however, the prophet is describing, not a real, but an imaginary scene, perhaps the most that can be said is that the familiar scenery about the Kidron furnished him some of the materials for his picture. In this imaginary hollow he represents himself as seeing the angel of Yahweh, and not only him, but *behind him*, or, since the angel must be conceived as facing now one way and then the other, beyond him, a number of *horses*,—he does not say how many,—some of which are of a *bay* colour, others *chestnut** and still others *white*. The mention of these colours indicates that the horses were divided into troops. That they had riders is taken for granted. Who these riders were is explained in the next verse.—**9.** The explanation is given in answer to a question by the prophet apparently addressed to the person just introduced. There are those who hold that it is he who now makes answer,† and this opinion, besides being a natural presupposition, is favoured by the seeming identification of the two in v. [10]. There are, however, serious objections. (1) The descriptive phrase that follows is superfluous as a means of identifying the angel of Yahweh. (2) Nor does it fit this person; for, as he has thus far not said anything, he cannot be described as one speaking with the prophet. On the other hand, a description is necessary for a new character, and this one suits an interpreter, especially if it be rendered *an angel that was speaking with me*. Indeed, in the form *the angel*, etc., it is capable of a similar inter-

* The derivation of the Heb. word שׂרוק, *ŝarok*, from שׂרק, *shine brightly*, would indicate that it denotes a bright reddish colour; but whether, with Ges., one should render it as above, or, with his latest revisers (BDB.), *sorrel*, it seems impossible to determine. The rendering *speckled* or *dappled*, in which the Vrss. agree, has no warrant in 𝔐.

† So Theod. Mops., Ra., Marck, Rosenm., Mau., Hi., *et al.*

pretation, for, thus translated, it is at the same time a description of a second person and an allusion to the familiar figure of the interpreter in the visions of Ezekiel. *Cf.* $8^{2\,f.}$ $40^{3\,ff.}$, etc. It is therefore fair to conclude that the angel here meant is as distinct from the one of the preceding verse as he is from the second to appear in $2^{7/3}$, and that he has a different function. He immediately declares his office. *I will show thee,* he says, *what these are.* He is here, as elsewhere in these visions,* a monitor and interpreter to prevent the prophet from missing anything that he should see or failing to understand its meaning.—**10.** It is not he, however, who actually gives the promised information. The reply comes from *the man that was standing among the myrtles.* Here, at first sight, seems to be a discrepancy indicating either that the idea of distinguishing two angels is mistaken, or, perhaps, that this verse is wholly (We.) or in part an interpolation. Neither of these inferences is necessary, as will appear, if due regard be paid to the following considerations: (1) The promise to *show* what the vision means does not require that the interpreter should do so by a direct and personal demonstration. (2) It is clear from the other visions that the prophet intended to make them as far as possible explain themselves. (3) A notable instance of the indirect method is found in the third, where the interpreter, instead of addressing the prophet, as he would have been expected to do, shows what he wishes the prophet to know by a message sent to a third person. In view of this example it ought not to seem strange for the prophet to put the answer to his own question into the mouth of the principal figure in the scene described. *These,* he says,—referring, not to the horses of various colours, but, as appears from v.[11], to their riders,—*these are they that Yahweh sent to traverse the earth.* Here are two or three points that deserve attention. In the first place, it is noteworthy that the angel of Yahweh, the speaker, here as in v.[12] and 3^{2} distinguishes between himself as a divine manifestation to his people and Yahweh the God of the whole earth. Observe, too, that the messengers were apparently all despatched together, and that at the time to which the vision refers they have accomplished their mission. It is therefore clearly useless to seek

* *Cf.* $2^{2}/1^{19}$ $^{7/3\,f.}$ $4^{1.\,4.\,5.}$ $5^{5.\,10}$ $6^{4.\,5}$.

for the key to the vision in the book of Daniel, or try, as some have done, to find in the colours of the horses symbols of any succession of events,* or empires.† Finally, it is significant that these horsemen, unlike those described in the Apocalypse (6), all had one and the same mission. This fact forbids the interpretation of the colours of the horses as intended, to use the language of Newcome, "to intimate the difference of their ministries."‡ Their mission was not to slay, burn and conquer, as Köhler explains, but, as appears from the next verse, to reconnoitre the earth§ and report on its condition. Now, a mission of this sort can evidently be executed quite as well and much more expeditiously by a given number of persons if they are divided into detachments and sent in different directions. It is therefore probable, especially in view of the unsatisfactoriness of other interpretations, that the prophet thought of these scouts as operating in this way and gave the horses different colours to distinguish the detachments from one another. He made the number three, if this is the original reading, perhaps because the sea to the west restricted his vision in that direction. See, however, 6[6 f.].

11. The horsemen do not wait for a direct command, but, on being introduced, make their report to the last speaker, who is again described as the one *who was standing among the myrtles.* They say, perhaps through a spokesman, *We have traversed the earth, and lo, the whole earth*—more exactly the population of the various countries of the earth—*resteth in quiet.* This statement at first sight seems intended to describe the state of things at the date of the vision,** but this can hardly be the correct interpretation. It is not probable that the adversaries of Darius were all subdued, and the Persian empire reduced to a state of complete tranquillity, by the month of February, 519 B.C.; or that, if the struggle for the throne was still in progress, the Jews, including Zechariah, were so ill informed with reference to matters in the East that they sup-

* For example, the varied fortunes of the Persian empire; Grot., Hd., *et al.*
† The Jews of Jerome's time saw in these colours symbols of the Assyrian, Babylonian and Medo-Persian, or the Medo-Persian, Macedonian and Roman empires. So Cyr., Klie., *et al.*
‡ So Bla., Köh. Ke., *et al.*
§ Not, as Luther and others render it, *the land.*
** So Dru., Grot., Marck, Lowth, Hd., We., Now., Marti, *et al.*

posed it had been decided. There are equally valid objections to the view that the prophet is here describing future conditions. The Jews in his day were not groaning in bondage and looking for deliverance from it, as such an interpretation would imply, but their fetters had been broken by Cyrus and they had since been free to return to their country and labour for its economic, if not for its political restoration. This is perfectly clear from the prophecies of Haggai; also from the last chapters of this collection, especially $6^{9\,ff.}$. A reference to the present and the future being improbable, there remains no alternative but, with van Hoonacker, to regard the vision as a picture of the past. The use of visions as a means of representing historical facts or truths is not without precedent in the Old Testament. There is a notable example in the book of Amos. The seventh chapter of that book begins with a series of three visions one object of which was effectively to portray to the sinning children of Israel the long-suffering of Yahweh in his dealings with them. If, therefore, Zechariah is here attempting to depict a historical situation, he is simply following the example of one of the greatest of his predecessors in the prophetic office. That this really is his object appears from a comparison of the language he uses here and in the following verses with that of the Second Isaiah.* The impression thus produced is only deepened when the next two visions are taken into account, for $2^{10/6\,ff.}$ not only suits the Babylonian period, but cannot well be understood as referring to any other. For details, see below. There is one objection to the view proposed, namely, that according to v. ^{12} the angel of Yahweh refers to the indignation of Yahweh as having endured seventy years; but see below. The only way to avoid the adoption of some such explanation as is there suggested is to reject the date given in v. ^{7} and refer this and the following chapter to the period of the Exile; but such a course is forbidden by the organic relation between these chapters and the next four and the evidence that these last were written after the accession of Darius Hystaspes. On the whole, then, it seems best to interpret this first vision as a picture of the past, that is, of the period of the Exile. There was a time previous to the appearance

* Cp. v. ^{11} and Is. 14^{7}; v. ^{13} and Is. 40^{1}; v. ^{14} and Is. 42^{13}; v. ^{17} and Is. 44^{26} 51^{3}.

of Cyrus as a conqueror when Babylon was apparently so powerful that it could fitly be called "mistress of kingdoms" (Is. 47^{5}), and its dominion so generally recognised that the Jews could be represented as meeting the promises of their prophets with the sceptical questions, "Is the spoil taken from the mighty? or the captive of the terrible delivered?" and it is probably this period that Zechariah had in mind when he put into the mouths of the returned horsemen the report that, wherever they went, they found undisturbed quiet.—**12.** There are various places in the Old Testament in which the condition just described is plainly represented as desirable. Thus, when, in 3^{11} and elsewhere in the book of Judges, the land is said to have "had rest" so or so many years, it means that a more or less serious conflict had been brought to a more or less satisfactory issue and the Hebrews permitted an interval of peace. *Cf.* also Is. 14^{7}. In this case the result was not favourable to them, but disastrous; and the peace that followed was the prize of their enemies. The Jews themselves, to be sure, had a kind of rest, but it was the rest of a pygmy in the hands of a giant. They could not be satisfied with it, however clearly they might come to see that they themselves were to blame for their helpless condition. Indeed, the more keenly they realised their culpability, the more eagerly they longed, and the more earnestly they prayed, for the future favour of Yahweh. All this finds expression in the pathetic appeal, ***how long wilt thou not have compassion***, or, to put it more idiomatically, ***how long wilt thou refuse to have compassion, on Jerusalem and the cities of Judah?*** The words might well have come from the prophet. His curiosity led him in v. ^{9} to ask about the horsemen and their significance. It would also have been natural for him, on hearing the report that there were as yet no signs of the interference of Yahweh in behalf of his afflicted people, to inquire how much longer they must wait for deliverance. Or, the interpreter might have acted as his spokesman. There are those who maintain that it must have been he who made the appeal, and that, therefore, either he is identical with the angel of Yahweh,* or the angel of Yahweh has been substituted for him,† because he is the one to whom the answer is addressed. *Cf.* v. ^{13}.

* So Theod. Mops., Ra., Marck, Rosenm., Mau., Hi., *et al.* † So Marti, Kit.

There are, however, good grounds for rejecting any such conclusion. In the first place, although, it must be confessed, Zechariah does not always express himself as clearly as one might desire, he seems to have intended to represent the angel who spoke with him as a mere interpreter. One would therefore hardly expect him to address Yahweh. On the other hand, there are reasons why the angel of Yahweh should be the next speaker. (1) It was he to whom the report of the horsemen was made. (2) A more convincing argument is found in the character of this angel as the prophet seems to have conceived him. He appears again, and very distinctly, in the fourth vision, where he rebukes Satan and rescues Joshua and his people from serious danger; in other words, he acts the part of a champion and defender of the Jewish people. In the book of Daniel this office is performed by the archangel Michael, whom another angel calls "the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people." *Cf.* Dn. 12^1. It must not, however, on this account be supposed that the archangel is intended.* The most that can be said is that Zechariah seems to have adopted a conception of the angel of Yahweh which prepared the way for the later doctrine according to which each people had its guardian angel. This, however, is enough to warrant one in believing that Zechariah gave to the angel of Yahweh the place he now occupies in this first vision. The angel of Yahweh, then, is the spokesman of Zechariah and his people, voicing their plea for mercy on the land that Yahweh has *cursed* with ruin and desolation *now seventy years*. The number seventy, as already noted, seems to contradict the suggestion that this vision relates to the past, being considerably too large for the period from the fall of Jerusalem to any date before the close of the Exile, an interval of only 586–538 = 48 years. This objection, however, can be answered by supposing either that, since the prophet evidently had in mind the passage from Jeremiah in which the Exile and its duration are predicted ($25^{1 \text{ff.}}$), he reckoned from 605 B.C., the date of that prophecy, or that, starting from the fall of Jerusalem, he inadvertently included the nineteen years that had elapsed since the capture of Babylon and the end of the Exile. In either case the result would

* So Theodoret, à Lap., Grot., *et al.*

be near enough to warrant him in using the round number seventy.* *Cf.* 7^1.

13. The appeal is answered, and, as it seems, by *Yahweh* in person, for the prophet can hardly have meant to represent the last speaker as acting two parts in so close connection.† How, then, is he to be understood? Does he mean to convey the impression that at this point the Deity made himself more directly manifest than through the angel who had thus far represented him, thus adding another to the number of supernal beings present? Probably not. A more satisfactory explanation is found by comparing this vision with the eighth, where Yahweh seems to be present, but unseen, namely, in the palace before which the chariots are mustered. Thence he gives his agents the command to depart, and thence he addresses the interpreter. *Cf.* 6^8. It is easy to imagine that in the present instance he speaks from the darkness round about him to the interpreter, and through him to the prophet, the *cheerful, comforting words* that follow. *Cf.* Is. 40^1.—**14.** They are given in the form in which the interpreter reported them to the prophet, commanding him to deliver them to his people. *I am very jealous.* Jealousy implies special interest on the part of one person for another. It often presupposes a bond between the parties that gives each of them a claim upon the other. The Hebrews represented Yahweh as having a peculiar interest in them;‡ as having, in fact, entered into a covenant with them by virtue of which he became, in a peculiar sense, their God and they his chosen people.§ They therefore felt that they owed him exclusive allegiance and that, in return, they might claim his special protection. Sometimes, however, a sense of their unworthiness inclined them to renounce this claim and throw themselves upon his mercy. Hosea goes almost too far in this direction. *Cf.* 8^{11},

* For some of the earlier attempts to explain the number seventy, see Bla. and New. Köh. and others reckon from the third of Jehoiakim, when, according to Dn. $1^{1\,f.}$, Nebuchadrezzar took Jerusalem the first time; but the passage on which their opinion is based is generally discredited.

† This is Stonard's idea. He says: "Those comfortable words certainly did not proceed from the interpreting angel, for to him they were addressed; nor from any of the company of horsemen, for they were only the messengers sent by Jehovah; still less can they be imagined to have come from Zechariah himself; and since no other person but the angel intercessor is described to be present, they must have proceeded from him. But he is no other than Jehovah himself."

‡ *Cf.* Am. 3^2 Ho. $11^{1\,ff.}$ Dt. $4^{37\,f.}$ $7^{6\,ff.}$, etc.

§ Ex. $34^{10\,f.}$ Dt. $29^{10/9\,ff.}$ Je. 7^{23}, etc.

etc. In v. ^{12} the appeal is not for justice, but mercy. Here, therefore, the jealousy of God must be regarded, not as a hostile affection,* but as something in him analogous to the feeling enkindled in human beings for sufferers and against those who afflict them. The object of his ardour on its tender side is *Jerusalem, even Sion.* The name Sion was first, without doubt, applied to the comparatively low hill, pierced by the Siloam tunnel, on which the ancient city had its beginning.† The application of it was afterward extended over the whole of the ridge of which this hill is a part, including the site of the temple (Jo. 2^{1}, etc.), and finally over the larger city covering other eminences to the west and the north. *Cf.* Is. $52^{1\,f.}$, etc. In v. ^{17} and elsewhere‡ Zechariah seems to use it as a synonym for Jerusalem. It is therefore probable that it should here be interpreted as meaning the city rather than the sacred mountain, and that in the ruined and desolate condition in which it was left by the Babylonians. *Cf.* Is. 44^{28} 54^{11}, etc.—**15.** The other side of Yahweh's jealousy reveals itself to the oppressors of his people. *But I am very wroth,* he continues, *against the careless,* or *arrogant, nations.* They are the same that are described in v. ^{11} as resting undisturbed, enjoying the fruits of conquest. The strength by which they won their success has given them a reckless confidence that shows itself in boasting. This spirit is the one that Isaiah condemned in the Assyrians. *Cf.* $10^{13\,f.}$. Zechariah is thinking of the Babylonians as portrayed in Is. $47^{6\,ff.}$. Their arrogance would in itself be offensive to Yahweh; but the immediate cause of his anger is that, when he was only *a little wroth* with his people, and therefore disposed to punish them but lightly, these nations, being employed for the purpose, *helped,* but *for harm.* The idea is a familiar one. Thus, Isaiah ($10^{6\,f.}$) rebukes the Assyrian for planning to exterminate those whom he was commissioned only to chastise, while the prophet of the Exile accuses the Babylonians of treating the Jews with such cruelty that in the end they paid double the divinely prescribed penalty. *Cf.* 47^{6} 40^{2}. Zechariah is here but repeating this accusation.§

* So New., Bla., *et al.* † 2 S. 5^{7} 1 K. $8^{1.\,6}$, etc. ‡ $2^{11/7.\,14/10}$ $8^{2\,f.}$.

§ There are several exegetes who see a discrepancy between this passage in its most obvious meaning and v. ^{2}, to avoid which they interpret "a little" as a limitation of the duration rather

16. *Therefore* introduces the divine purpose based on the facts above given. Because he has a special regard for Jerusalem, and it has already received from his hand double for all its sins, he *will return* to the city, the place of his former abode. The Second Isaiah describes the return of Yahweh as a triumphal procession, for which a highway is to be made through the desert, and at which all the world will wonder.* It would have been folly for Zechariah in his vision to copy this glowing prediction; for those for whose instruction and encouragement he wrote knew that it had not been fulfilled.† They felt, however, that Cyrus was as really an instrument of the divine will as Nebuchadrezzar, and they were prepared to believe that Yahweh had at last relented, so that he would henceforth reveal himself among them in *compassion*. Indeed, the prophet could, and did, go further. Haggai had accomplished his mission, and the foundation of the temple had been laid. It did not, therefore, require great faith to believe that this structure would be completed and the city restored; in other words, that the prediction of Is. 44^{28} would be fulfilled. The prophet, at any rate, believed it, and, in testimony of his confidence, put into the mouth of Yahweh the remaining words of this verse: *My house shall be built therein, and a line*, the line used as a measure by builders, *shall be stretched over Jerusalem*. *Cf.* $2^{5/1\,ff.}$. Note that the emphasis is here on the material blessings resulting from the presence of Yahweh. In 8^3 it is on the spiritual.—**17.** Here was an excellent opportunity for extravagant language such as even Haggai (2^7) could not altogether repress. Zechariah, however, as v. [16] has shown, was more temperate than his contemporary. He therefore omits any prediction with reference to the future splendour of the new sanctuary. The most he permits himself, if the text is correct, is a general prophecy of prosperity. *The cities*,—in v. [12] "the cities of Judah,"—he makes Yahweh say, *shall again overflow with good*, the temporal blessings which all men

than the severity of the divine wrath. So Ki., Grot., Marck, Lowth, Ston., Pres., Wri., *et al.* If, however, as has been shown, v. [3] is an interpolation, there is no need of resorting to such violence.

* *Cf.* Is. $40^{3\,ff.}$ 43^{20}, etc.

† They knew, too, that the overthrow of the Babylonian empire was not so spectacular an event as had been expected, and this is the reason why one (GASm.) does not find it predicted in this passage.

crave and which God bestows upon those who please him. This general promise is followed by another for the capital in particular: *Yahweh will yet*, in answer to the petition implied in v. [12], *have compassion on* Sion, and again*, as in the days of its prosperity, *take pleasure in Jerusalem.*†

Here ends the first vision. It is a picture of the past. At first it was not clear what Zechariah meant by it; but in the course of the above discussion his purpose has become more apparent. The Jews had been raised to the highest pitch of expectation by the prophecies of the Second Isaiah. The results, to them, of the triumph of Cyrus had fallen so far short of their hopes that they were grievously disappointed. Some of them must have well-nigh lost their faith in the God of their fathers. It was therefore time for some one who was sane, sober and practical to put the whole matter in a less tragical aspect, showing his people that Yahweh had after all really intervened in their behalf, and encouraging them to expect his continued assistance. This seems to have been Zechariah's object in his first vision. The practical effect of the saner view, as he doubtless foresaw, would naturally be an increase of interest and energy in the enterprise which he, as well as Haggai, probably regarded as the first duty of the restored community, the rebuilding of the national sanctuary. *Cf.* v. [16].

7. עשתי עשר] The later idiom for אחד עשר, which occurs only in Gn. 32^{23} 37^{9} Dt. 1^{2}; cp. Dt. 1^{3}.—הוא—שבט] The reasons for regarding this clause as an interpolation are: (1) that neither Haggai nor Zechariah, in v. [1], adds the name to the number of the month; and (2) that the practice of so doing seems to belong to a much later date, being confined, except in one instance that requires special consideration, to Est. *Cf.* 7^{1}.—עִדוֹא] For עדו, v. [1]; like רבוא, Ez. 2^{64}, for רבו, 1 Ch. 29^{7}, and נקיא, Jo. 4^{19}, for נקי, Ex. 23^{7}, etc.; Ew. § 16c.—**8.** רכב—אדם] First suspected by Ew., it is omitted by We., Now., Marti, Kit. The objections to its genuineness are: (1) that the predicates רכב and עמד are hardly compatible with each other; (2) that the introduction of this clause produces the impression that the angel of Yahweh is the leader of the celestial scouts, and not, as in v. [11], the one to whom they report; (3) that there is no use made of it in the subsequent narrative; and (4) that, if the clause were genuine, והוא,

* The text has *comfort*, but see the critical notes.

† *Cf.* $2^{16/12}$ 3^{2} Is. 14^{1}. On the rendering *take pleasure*, see especially Is. 56^{4} $58^{5\,f.}$ 65^{12} 66^{3}.

which the later critics without warrant omit, would precede it, the second prtc. being introduced by the simple ו.—חהרסים] 𝔊$^{\aleph B}$, *τῶν ὀρέων* = ההרים; 𝔊^{AQ} and some curss., *τῶν δύο ὀρέων* = שני ההרים. The former reading is adopted by Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Che., Marti, van H., *et al.* It is easier, however, to explain these readings by 6^1 than it is to account for that of the text on the supposition that it is corrupt.—בַּמְּצֻלָה] So Houb., Norzi, Baer, Gins.; for במצולה. Other readings are: בַּמְּצָלָה, Fürst, בִּמְצִלָּה, Bö., and בַּמְּצִלָּה, Ew., BDB., all with the general sense of *in the shadow*. *Cf.* 𝔊, *κατασκίων*; 𝔖, ܕܡܛܠܠܐ. The rendering *in the hollow* is evidently preferable if the correctness of ההרסים is maintained. —אחריו] Marti suggests לפניו; but that would naturally mean that the horsemen were between the angel and the prophet, which can hardly be what the latter intended.—שרקים] 𝔊$^{\aleph ABQ}$ have *καὶ ψαροὶ καὶ ποικίλοι*, a reading which, at first sight, favours the view that 𝔐 originally had horses of four colours; but the similarity of the two here named, and the omission of the former by 𝔊$^{\aleph c. b}$, some curss., 𝔖^{H}, make it probable that this one is a gloss to the other. If, therefore, 𝔊 has preserved a fourth colour in *ποικίλοι* = ברדים, it has lost the one represented by שרקים. For the latter Marti rds. שחרים, thus bringing this passage into accord with $6^{2\,f.}$. It does not, however, seem necessary that the two passages should so perfectly agree, or natural that, if Zechariah wrote שחרים, this comparatively familiar word should have given place to the ἅ. λ. of the present text. Asada, following 𝔊 𝔖, reads ושרקים; but the ו need not be supplied unless וברדים is added. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{132.\,1.\,R.\,2}$.—**9.** ויאמר—בי] 𝔖 ܘܥܢܐ ܡܠܐܟܐ ܕܡܡܠܠ ܥܡܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܝ = ויען המלאך הדבר בי ויאמר אלי, and this reading seems favoured by vv. $^{10-12}$; but v. ^{14} has the precise formula here used.—המלאך] The art. is properly used whether the thought be that the angel is one to whom attention is called for the first time or one with whom and his function the reader is supposed to be familiar. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{126.\,4}$.—בי] Not *in me*, with 𝔊 𝔙, Jer., Theod. Mops., Marck, Pu., *et al.*, but, as in Nu. $12^{6.\,8}$ Hb. 2^1, where the most intimate communion between God and man is described, *with me;* the prep. denoting, not instrumentality, Ew. § $^{217\,f.\,3}$, but proximity. *Cf.* BDB. $^{89\,a}$.—המה] The pron. is not, as Ges. § $^{141.\,b}$ implies, and Wright expressly asserts, a substitute for the copula, but, as Dr. puts it, "an imperfect anticipation of the subject," which here has the force of an appositive. *Cf.* Dr. § $^{201\,(3)}$; Kö. § $^{338\,d}$. In a direct question אלה might come first. *Cf.* Is. 49^{21}.—**10.** ויען] This verb naturally introduces a speech by one who has been directly addressed, but, since it may also introduce a speech by any one interested in a given subject (*cf.* v. ^{11} Gn. 23^{10} Ju. 18^{14}, etc.), its use here proves nothing with reference to the question whether the man among the myrtles and the interpreter are the same or different persons. We., who regards them as distinct, finds in the fact that the former answers a question put to the latter a reason for suspecting the genuineness of the whole verse;

but such "interference" is a common occurrence to an oriental.—ההדסים] 𝔊, τῶν ὀρέων, as in v. [8].

11. מלאך יהוה] The person to whom the horsemen report is no doubt the angel of Yahweh, but, if he had been so called in the original text, the descriptive clause *that was standing among the myrtles* would hardly have been added. We. is therefore probably correct in the surmise that the original reading was האיש here as in v. [10]. So also Marti, Kit. Now., on the other hand, following Hi., omits the descriptive clause.—בארץ] 𝔊^NABQ, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν; but 𝔊^L om. πᾶσαν, which, moreover, is easily explained as a loan from the next clause.—ושקטת] A pred. adj. with the force of an adverbial phrase, like ושלוה in 7[7].—12. מלאך יהוה] A reason for retaining this reading additional to those given in the comments is that the insertion of the same words in v. [11] is more easily explained on the supposition that the angel of Yahweh was expressly named in this verse.—אתה] The separate pron. here seems to be used rather for rhythmical effect than for emphasis. *Cf.* Ges. § [135. 1].—זעמתה] For זעמת. *Cf.* Ges. § [44. 2. R. 2].—זה] Not a pron., as 𝔊 𝔙, Lu., EV. render it, but an adv. *Cf.* Ges. § [136. R. 2 (b)].—13. יהוה] 𝔊^NABQ add παντοκράτωρ, which, however, Comp., 𝔊^Jer., Chrys. omit.—הדבר בי] Acc. to Now. an interpolation; but, since it is the interpreter who delivers the message, it would seem most natural that he should receive it.—דברים] 𝔊 𝔖 prefix a connective.—נחמים] An abstr. pl. used appositively for gen. *Cf.* Ges. §§ [124. 1 (b); 131. 2 (b)]; Dr. § [189 (1)].—14. לירושלם ולציון] In 𝔊^L the names are transposed.—קנאה גדולה] *Cf.* vv. [2. 15]; Ges. § [117. 2 (a)].—15. וקצף גדול] *Cf.* v. [14].—השאננים] Houb. rds. השאטיה, *That despise it* (Jerusalem). To עזרו he would give the force of Ar. عزر iv., *multiply*.—אשר] Here a conj. *Cf.* Ges. § [158].

16. ליהוה] Kenn. 195 adds צבאות. So 𝔊^A 𝔖, and, since it occurs in 17 out of 19 similar cases, this may well be the correct reading.—בה] On the *daghesh*, *cf.* Ges. § [20. 2 (a) (2)]. קוה] So also 1 K. 7[23] Je. 31[38/39]; but always Qr. קו.—17. עוד] 𝔊 transfers this word to the preceding verse and puts into its place καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς μὲ ὁ ἄγγελος λάλων ἐν ἐμοί.—תפוצינה] For תפוצנה, the reading of 24 Kenn. mss. *Cf.* Ges. § [72. 5. R.] Houb. rds. תפרצנה.—ערי מטוב] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, הערים טוב or, as in v. [12], ערי יהודה מטוב.—ונחם] Rd., with 𝔊 (καὶ ἐλεήσει) ורחם, as in v. [12]. So Oort., We., Now., Marti, Kit. 𝔖 has ܘܢܒܢܐ = ובנה, which, however, Sebök is probably correct in regarding as an error for ܘܢܒܐܐ = ונחם.

(2) THE HORNS AND THEIR DESTROYERS ($2^{1-4}/1^{18-21}$).

The second vision attaches itself naturally and closely to the first. In it the prophet sees four horns, and, when their significance has been explained, as many workmen commissioned to destroy them;

the whole being a picture of the process by which Yahweh intends to fulfil the promise of the first vision.

$2^1/1^{18}$. There is no date. None is needed. The relation of this vision to the first is such that the date of the one must be the date of the other, the twenty-fourth of the eleventh month of the second year of the Persian king Darius. *Then*, says the prophet, meaning after the first vision had passed, *I lifted up my eyes*. Here, as in the former case, the language is figurative, since the vision is only a literary form for the thought that the prophet wishes to convey. This time there appear, first, *four horns*. There is nothing to indicate the manner of their appearance, whether as attached or separate members, but the absence of any reference to animals or their movements favours the latter alternative.* They at once recall the horns, great and small, of the book of Daniel; but, since that book is without doubt a product of the Maccabean period, as between the two its author, and not Zechariah, must be regarded as the imitator. The origin of the symbol common to them is easily traced. To the Hebrews the ox, like the lion, typified strength (Ps. $22^{13/12}$), and its horns were the feature that they emphasised. *Cf.* Dt. 23^{17}. Hence it was natural that Amos (6^{13}) should represent Israel as boasting of having taken to themselves horns, and that Zedekiah, the son of Chenaanah, should wear a pair in the tableau by which he pictured the triumph of the allied forces of Israel and Judah over the Syrians. *Cf.* 1 K. 22^{11}. This, however, seems to be the earliest instance in which the horn is used to symbolise, not power, but, as will appear, a power, that is, a powerful nation. Therein, perhaps, lies the reason why Zechariah is so careful to explain the figure.

$2^2/1^{19}$. The method of question and answer is continued. The prophet inquires of his angelic interpreter, *Sir, what are these?* referring to the horns. The angel replies, *These are the horns that scattered Judah*. These words have been variously interpreted. Not that there is any difference of opinion concerning their general import. It is agreed that the Targum is correct in interpreting

* The contrary is maintained by J. D. Mich. (*Lex. Heb.*), who thinks the prophet saw a pair of oxen in grass so tall that their horns only were visible. Ston. insists that there must have been four animals, "bearing each a single horn, high and pointed, like that of the he-goat in Daniel." Similarly Pres., Pu., Wri., Per., *et al.*

horns as meaning kingdoms, that, in other words, these horns represent political powers. The disagreement arises when an attempt is made to identify the powers. Now, it is clear that, since the horns are described as those that produced a dispersion, the first thing to do is to fix the date and circumstances of this event, or series of events. The text seems to furnish the necessary data. It says that these horns scattered, not only Judah, but *Israel*. But Israel, when used in conjunction with Judah, regularly denotes the northern, in distinction from the southern, kingdom and it is regularly so used even by the later prophets.* If, therefore, as one has a right to expect, it is used in that sense in this connection, the dispersion to which the prophet refers must include that of the northern as well as the southern tribes; in other words, one must reckon Assyria as well as Babylonia among the powers involved.† This is the natural inference from the text as it reads, but such an inference does not harmonise with the impression derived from the preceding chapter. The dispersion to which allusion is there made is the dispersion of Judah only, the result of the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar. This fact excites doubt concerning the genuineness of *Israel* in the passage under consideration, and the doubt thus excited is confirmed by v. ^{4}, where the horns are again introduced, but the name Israel is omitted. It follows that here, also, the prophet had the Judean dispersion in mind, and that he used the horns to represent the power or powers instrumental in that catastrophe.‡ Rashi recognises only one power, "the Babylonians at the four winds of heaven";§ and his view is not without a semblance of support in the wide extent of the Babylonian empire under Nebuchadrezzar, by virtue of which he, like the kings before and after him, called himself "king of the four quarters."** Still, it must be rejected, because the Babylonians, though the strongest, were not the only people that helped the Jews to their

* *Cf.* Je. $3^{6.11.18}$ 5^{11} Ez. 9^{9} 27^{17}, etc.

† So Jer., Cyr., Ki., Dru., Klie., Ston., Pres., Pu., Wri., *et al.*

‡ The adoption of this emendation is greatly to be desired. It will prevent any further violence to the troublesome name, which has been interpreted, not only as an honorary title, Ke., but as a collective title for rural as distinguished from urban, Or., common as compared with noble, Neumann and even faithless, as contrasted with faithful Jews, Klie.

§ So van Hoonacker.

** *KB.*, iii, 1, 108 *f.*; 2, 96 *f.*

destruction,* as the use of the plural in v. [4] clearly indicates. There is equally good ground for rejecting any interpretation which makes the horns represent four distinct powers including Babylonia. The reply is that, as the Jews had more than four adversaries, but no others of the same class with the Babylonians, it is impossible to identify the other three, and that, this being the case, the vision becomes meaningless. The impossibility of finding a power or powers that the prophet can safely be supposed to have had in mind makes it necessary to give to the horns a broader interpretation. Theodoret of Mopsuestia does so. He says that they designate "those who from many sides attacked" God's people, "and sought in every way to injure them," the number four being chosen, because the Hebrews, like others, divided the world into four quarters and naturally represented anything coming from all directions as coming from the cardinal points. *Cf.* "the four winds of heaven," 6^5.† This seems to have been nearly the thought of the prophet; but in developing it care must be taken to avoid the mistake of including, as many have done, the enemies of both kingdoms, or those of the Jews after the Babylonian period, for these horns symbolise the power only of the peoples, especially the Babylonians, who by their hostility contributed to the final overthrow of the Jewish state and the banishment of the Jewish people from their soil.

$2^3/1^{20}$. The vision is not yet complete. *Yahweh*, says the prophet, imitating the phraseology of Amos in the first four of his visions ($1^{1.\,4.\,7}$ 8^1), *showed me four workmen*. Not that, at this point, Yahweh called his attention to something that he had not before noticed. The figures were now first brought upon the scene. They were figures of men of skill and strength, fitted, therefore, for any task, able to build, but no less, to use the words of Ez. $21^{36/31}$, "skilful to destroy." On the number of the workmen, see below.—**$2^4/1^{21}$.** The prophet seems to have conceived of the workmen as having something distinctive, either in the dress they wore or the implements they carried, which made them at once recog-

* *Cf.* Je. 12^{14} Ez. $25^{3.\,8}$ 28^{24} 35^5, etc.

† Similarly, Lu., Cal., Ribera, Marck, New., Rosenm., Hi., Köh., Hd., Burger, Per., We., Now., Marti, *et al.*

nisable. At any rate, he does not ask who they are, but only, *What are these coming to do?* The reply, doubtless from the interpreter, first repeats the explanation just given, *Those are the horns that scattered Judah;* adding a clause descriptive of the thoroughness with which the hostile forces did their destructive work, *so that he,* meaning Judah, *did not*, because he could not, *uplift his head*. The condition thus described is the condition of the Jews during the Exile, when they dared not believe that they could be taken from their mighty conquerors. *Cf.* Is. $49^{24\,f.}$. For a similar figure, see Am. 5^2. Turning now to the workmen, the interpreter explains, *These are come to cast down*. Here again it is easy to mistake the prophet's meaning. Just as the prominence of the Babylonians in the dispersion of the Jews seems to mark them as the power symbolised by the horns, or one of them, so their overthrow by the Persians seems to require that these latter be regarded as the power, or one of four such powers, represented by the workmen. In this case, however, as in the preceding, the first impression is erroneous. Indeed, it will be found, not only that the workmen do not represent Persia alone or with any number of other powers, but that they have a clearly different function. The only satisfactory explanation for them is suggested by $1^{10\,f.}$, and more clearly indicated in $6^{6\,ff.}$. In the latter passage there is evident reference to the conquest of Babylonia. In alluding to it, however, Yahweh ignores human instrumentalities. It is his angelic agents who have appeased his spirit in that region. Now, since the passage under consideration appears to be a forecast of the event described as accomplished in the vision of the chariots, it is fair to conclude that here also the prophet, like Ezekiel in his description of Gog and his followers, is employing the apocalyptic method, and that therefore these workmen, as Jerome perceived, represent the supernatural means through which Yahweh accomplishes his purposes.* They are four in number to indicate that the penalty for the injury done Judah will be as comprehensive as the offence was general. They will *cast down*† *the horns*, utterly destroy the power, *of* all *the nations that uplifted themselves*,

* Similarly, Theod. Mops., Cyr., Theodoret, Lu., Cal., Dru., à Lap., Köh., GASm., *et al.*
† Elsewhere horns are "cut off." *Cf.* Je. 48^{25} Ps. 75^{11} La. 2^3.

used violence, *against the land of Judah, to scatter it*, or, more strictly speaking, its inhabitants.

The tameness of the prophet's language is even more noticeable in this than in the preceding vision. The reason is the same in this case as in the other. He is dealing with comparatively recent history, especially the conquest of Babylonia, an event which, although it had great significance for the Jews, was anything but spectacular. The capital, so far from resisting the Persian conqueror, yielded without a blow. In fact, when Cyrus entered the city, it greeted him as its deliverer. It would have been worse than useless for the prophet, in this vision, to enlarge upon the simple fact that the conqueror of Judah had been punished. Having presented this to the best of his ability, he passes to the third and final phase of his present subject.

$2^1/1^{18}$. In 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖^LU, as in English, this verse and the three that follow are reckoned to ch. 1.—ואׂרא] Here and in v. ⁵ 5⁹ for ואראה, which is found 5¹ 6¹; here also acc. to 4 Kenn. mss. *Cf.* Ges. §§ 49. 2 (b); 75. 6. R. (c).—**2.** מה אלה] Add, with 𝔊 𝔖, ארני, as in 1⁹ 4⁴ 6⁴.—את ישראל] The most convincing reasons for pronouncing this name an interpolation, (1) that it does not fit the context, and (2) that it is wanting in v. ⁴, have already been stated. Note in addition, (3) that it is not found elsewhere in the book except in 8¹³, where it is as much out of place as in this passage.—וירושלם] Om., with Kenn. 180, 𝔊^AQ 𝔖^H. The omission of את, also, is against it. Both names are disregarded by We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**3.** חרשים] According to Mich. and others to be pointed חֹרְשִׁים and rendered *plowmen;* but such a rendering requires too much explanation in v. ⁴.—**4.** ואֹמַר] Some mss. have ואמר.—לעשות] 𝔊^L adds *κύριε* = ארני, as in 1⁹ 4⁴ 6⁴.—לאמר] Rd., with Kenn. 178, 𝔊^AQ 𝔖, אלי.—אלה²] Acc. to We. a scribal error. Without it the words that follow would read, *The horns that scattered Judah, so that he did not uplift his head, them to terrify came these*, etc. This rendering, however, is not satisfactory. (1) The construction ויבאו requires that a complete sentence precede it; and (2) the phrase להחריד אתם, on which this emendation is based, as will be shown, is itself an interpolation. The pron., therefore, must remain if the words following are recognised as genuine. Marti omits them as far as ראשו, also אלה², at the same time substituting באים for ויבאו, and, at first sight, he seems justifiable in so doing; but there are contrary considerations. The clause, *These are the horns that scattered Judah*, is not a mere repetition of the angel's first answer. The addition of the next transforms it from a statement of fact into an explanation and a justification of the

workmen's purpose. The latter clause, however, should be emended by inserting אשר before איש, with Köh. and others, or, with We., substituting the former for the latter. *Cf.* Mal. 2⁹. If the former method be adopted, נשא might be pointed as a prtc. 𝔙's *per singulos viros*. *Et nemo* . . . appears to be a case of free expansion. 𝔊 takes greater liberty with the text, adding the irreconcilable gloss, *καὶ τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατέαξαν*.—ויבאו] 𝔊^NB Jer. have *καὶ ἐξῆλθοσαν*; but 𝔊^AQ, *καὶ εἰσῆλθον*.—להחריד אתם] 𝔊, *ὀξῦναι*; whence Bla. conjectures that the original reading in 𝔐 was להחדיר אֵתָם, *sharpening their coulter*. Gunkel (*Schöpfung u. Chaos*, 122) suggests לְהָתֵר אֹתָם. The coulter, however, does not seem the suitable instrument for the purpose of casting down the horns. Nor is it probable that להחריד is a mistake for להחריך (حرك, Houb.), להחרים (Secker) or להחריב (Marti). A verb with any such meaning would come more naturally after than before לידות. The same is true of the one found in the text, and this is one reason for suspecting the genuineness of the whole clause. Another is the use of the masc. for the fem. suf. in אתם. *Cf.* Ex. 27² Ps. 75^{11/10}. Finally, note the absence of ו before לידות. The clause can best be explained as a gloss to לידות את קרנות הגוים, the antecedent of the sf. of את being הגוים. Perhaps, however, the vb. was originally להוריד.—קרן] The word sounds strange with נשא, the regular idiom having הרים. Rd., therefore, הַנִּשָּׂאִים, *that uplifted themselves*, and omit this word.—אל] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, על.

(3) THE MAN WITH THE MEASURING LINE ($2^{5/1-9/5}$).

In this his third vision the prophet sees a man on his way to measure the site of Jerusalem, to whom he afterward hears the interpreter send a message foretelling the limitless growth and prosperity of the city under the protection of Yahweh.

5/1. There has been some difference of opinion with reference to the identity of the ***man with a measuring line***. Thus, Rashi, Maurer and others think he is the same with the interpreter, ignoring the obvious fact that the prophet does not introduce the latter until the former has answered his question. It is also a mistake to identify him with the angel of Yahweh as Jerome, Keil and others have done. The angel of Yahweh, although he, also, in 1⁸ is called a man, always takes the leading part in any scene in which he appears. *Cf.* 1¹¹ 3^{1 ff.}. This is a subordinate figure, like the horsemen of the first vision, whose part it is to furnish an occasion for the promise that is to follow.—**6/2.** A line like that

which the man is represented as carrying had various uses among the Hebrews. When employed as a symbol, therefore, it might have one or another of several different meanings. In the first vision (1^{16}), to be sure, when Yahweh said, "A line shall be stretched over Jerusalem," the words were a promise that the city should be rebuilt; but no Jew could forget that Amos had used the same figure of the partition of Samaria among foreigners, and the author of 2 K. 21^{13} of the destruction of the Judean capital. The fact that the symbol was thus ambiguous, perhaps, is one of the reasons why the prophet pictures himself as asking the man, *Whither art thou going?* Another is his fondness for the interrogative style. The answer is not precisely the one that 1^{16} would lead the reader to expect; for, instead of repeating the promise of that passage, the man says he is going *to measure Jerusalem, to see how wide it is*, or is to be, *and how long*. Nor is it at once apparent what he means by these words. Marti sees in them an expression of "impatient curiosity" concerning the dimensions of the future city. There is, however, little ground for asserting the existence of any such sentiment in Zechariah's time. A better interpretation is suggested by v. ^{8}. In view of the prediction there made it seems best to regard the man with the measuring line as representing the narrower and more cautious Jews, who, in spite of the preaching of Haggai, formed an influential practical party. They were patriotic in a way. They wished to see Jerusalem restored. They were perhaps doing what they could to rebuild it. But they insisted upon caring first for the material needs of the community, and planning in this or any other direction only so far as tangible resources would warrant. They were the people who, when Haggai began his agitation, said that the time had not come to build the house of Yahweh. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{2}. They doubtless thought it much more important that the city should have a wall than a temple,—but they would not have approved of a wall of unnecessary dimensions. They might have been called "the party of the measuring line."—**7/3.** At this point the interpreter is again introduced, according to the Greek Version, as *standing* near the prophet. At the same time *another angel* is described as *coming toward* him, namely, the interpreter. This is not the angel of Yahweh,

the man among the myrtles of the first vision;—he would hardly be called "another angel" or assigned to an inferior position;—but apparently a third whose only function is to act as messenger for the interpreter.—**8/4.** The second of the points just made takes for granted that the speaker in this verse is the interpreter, and the angel his messenger. This has frequently been denied.* The question hinges to some extent on the further inquiry with reference to the person in the command, *Run, speak to yonder youth.* Many have taken this youth for Zechariah himself,† and drawn important conclusions from the term by which they supposed him to be designated. The more defensible opinion, however, is that he should be identified with the man with the measuring line; for the term fits him, employed as he was, better than the prophet, and the message, though intended for the prophet, would naturally be addressed to the one who was making the useless measurements. The bearing of this result on the main question is evident. If the youth is the man with the measuring line, it must be the interpreter who sent him the message, and not the other angel, who would have had to take the interpreter from the prophet's side for the purpose. Finally, it should be observed that the contrary opinion makes the interpreter dependent on the other angel for the very knowledge which his office implies. It is the interpreter, then, who sends, and the other angel who carries, the message.‡ It is a rebuke of the selfish and faithless opportunism that the youth represented, and a protest against permitting "the day of small things" to determine the future of Jerusalem. Zechariah,—for, of course, it is he who is speaking through the interpreter,—although, as has been shown, he could not ignore facts, had imagination. He shows it here by refusing to set a limit to the growth of the city, predicting that it will burst all bounds, extend itself indefinitely, and *lie* open *like the villages* of the country *on account of the multitude of men and cattle in it. Cf.* Je. 49^{31} Ez. 38^{11}.—**9/4.** The prophet did not, in the preceding verse, give the ground of his confidence. It now appears that he based his prediction concerning the future of the city

* So Jer., Theod. Mops., Dru., Pem., New., Bla., Ston., Ew., Ke., Pu., Reu., van H., *et al.*

† So Jer., AE., Cal., Rib., Dru., á Lap., Pem., Bla., Lowth, Rosenm., Ke., Köh., Pres., Pu., *et al.*

‡ So Marck, Mau., Hi., Klie., Or., Wri., Per., We., Now., Marti, *et al.*

on the promised presence of Yahweh. The temple was already in building. When it was completed, and the service therein resumed, he saw that Jerusalem would no longer be merely a little mountain town, the refuge of a few struggling Jews, but would inevitably become the religious shrine and capital of a race; and he expected that the God of their fathers would again reveal himself to them there. *Cf.* vv. $^{11-15}$ 8^{3}. Then, as truly as in the days of the Exodus, he would be *a wall of fire* round about*, a sure defence, if any were needed, against their adversaries. *Cf.* v. $^{15/11}$ $8^{22\text{ f.}}$ Is. 26^{1}. The prophet also makes Yahweh promise to be a *splendour* in the city. Haggai had seen a similar vision (2^{7}), but the splendour he saw was that of gifts of silver and gold brought to the new temple. That seen by Zechariah is the splendour of the divine presence symbolised by the fiery cloud which Ezekiel saw enter the sanctuary ($43^{1\text{ ff.}}$), but more gloriously manifested in the reign of truth and holiness among the fortunate inhabitants of the future city. *Cf.* 8^{3}.

In the foregoing comments it has been taken for granted that, while, in the first two visions, Zechariah was dealing with the past, in this third he was attempting to forecast the future. There is nothing in the text to contradict this supposition. It is confirmed by the fact that the prophecy here made, unlike those that have preceded it, does not harmonise with conditions either before or after the time of the prophet. The city did not prosper as he expected, and Nehemiah, after nearly three-quarters of a century, was moved to rebuild the wall, as the only means of preserving the inhabitants from dispersion or annihilation. The three visions thus far examined, therefore, form a series the object of which was, by a review of the past, to prepare the reader for increased faith in God for the future. It was evidently constructed in imitation of that in Am. 7. For later parallels, see the visions of chs. 7 *f.* of Daniel, and the interpretation of ch. 11 of the same book.

5/1. Here begins ch. 2, acc. to 𝔊 𝔙, also acc. to 𝔗 in the great polyglots.—וארא] 2 Kenn. mss. rd. ואראה. *Cf.* v. ^{1}.—**6/2.** ואמר] Add, with 𝔊 𝔖, אליו.—רחבה . . . ארכה] 𝔖 reverses the order.—**7/3.** ויצא] We.,

* Ex. 14^{20} should read, "When it became dark, it," the pillar of fire between the Hebrews and the Egyptians, "lighted the night." *Cf.* We., *Hex.*; Baentsch, *Ex.*

following 𝔊 (ἵστηκει), rds. עֹמֵד. So also Now., Marti, Kit. Better, with Asada, נִצָּב.—**8/4.** אֵלָיו] Rd. אֵלָיו. *Cf.* Ges. § 91. 2. R. 1. 4 Kenn. mss. rd. אֵלַי. 𝔊^ABQΓ add λέγων.—הַלָּז] For הַלָּזֶה. *Cf.* Ges. § 34. 2. R. 1. —פְּרָזוֹת] Adverbial acc. = כִּפְרָזוֹת. *Cf.* Ges. § 118.5 (c); Dr. § 161 (2). 𝔊, κατακάρπως, as if from פֹּרִיָּה, *fruitful*. *Cf.* Ez. 19[10].—**9/5.** וַאֲנִי] Emphatic. *Cf.* Ges. § 135. 1.

(4) AN APPEAL TO THE EXILES ($2^{10/6-17/13}$).

The rest of the chapter has usually been treated as a part of the preceding vision, but this arrangement must be abandoned. The reasons are as follows: (1) The speaker is not the same as in v. [9], but the prophet now takes the place of the interpreter. This appears from his references to himself in vv. [13 f.]; also from the fact, itself another reason for making these verses a separate paragraph, that (2) the persons addressed are no longer any of those who have appeared in the visions, but the Jews who still remain in Babylonia. Finally, (3) these verses are not an enlargement upon the third vision, but an appeal based upon the whole trio, in which the prophet exhorts his people to separate themselves from the nations destined to perish and return to Palestine, there to enjoy in a restored community the presence and protection of Yahweh.

10/6. The prophet does not at first designate by any name those whom he is addressing. He simply exhorts them to *flee from the north country;* but it is only necessary to turn to v. [11] to find that the north country is Babylonia and those who are exhorted to flee thence exiled inhabitants of Jerusalem. This summons does not, as Kosters* claims, imply that previous to this time no Jews had returned from Babylonia. The prophet would hardly have presented the past as he has in the preceding visions if the promises there made had not to some extent been fulfilled. It means merely that, although, as 6[10] clearly shows, some of those who had been carried into captivity, or their descendants, had returned, their number was comparatively small, and that those who had the interests of the new community at heart felt the need of further reinforcements from the same direction, especially in the work of rebuilding the national sanctuary. The exhortation, as already in-

* *Die Wiederherstellung Israels*, 20.

timated, is repeated in v. ^{11}, but these two members of a parallelism are separated by a parenthetical clause which seems to have been intended to explain the presence of the Jews in Babylonia. One rendering for it is, *for to the four winds of heaven have I dispersed you.*—**11/7.** Now follows the second member of the parallelism. This time, however, as in Is. 51^{16}, the Jews, although they are in Exile, are addressed under the familiar name *Sion*,—perhaps originally *daughter of Sion*, which occurs Is. 52^{2} and La. 4^{22} in the same sense. That the exiles, and not, as one might at first sight think, the actual inhabitants of Jerusalem, are meant, is clear from the added phrase *dwellers in Babylon*. The language used was calculated to remind them of their birthright.

12/8. The speaker next proceeds, as if about to give a reason for the summons he has issued, but interrupts himself, or is interrupted, by a parenthetical statement that has never been satisfactorily explained. It reads, literally, *after glory he sent me*. The subject is evidently Yahweh. The object, who is undoubtedly the same as in vv. $^{13/9}$ and $^{15/11}$, must be the prophet. There is great difficulty with the phrase *after glory*. The English words would naturally be taken to denote the purpose of the speaker's mission, namely, to obtain for himself or another glory in the sense of *renown*. It does not seem to have occurred to any one to take the word in another meaning frequent in the Old Testament, that of *splendour*, which, when it refers to the Deity, becomes synonymous with the manifestation of Yahweh. *Cf.* Ez. 3^{23}. If this sense be given to it in the present instance, the troublesome clause will become a simple statement, apparently by the prophet, that Yahweh gave him the message he is delivering after the vision, or series of visions, previously described. It seems to have been suggested by the resemblance between the experience of Zechariah and that of Ezekiel as recorded in the first two chapters of his book. In fact, the words here used were evidently borrowed from that book. In 1^{28} Ezekiel describes the theophany he has just witnessed as having the appearance of a rainbow. "This," says he, "was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of Yahweh." Then he proceeds ($2^{1\,ff.}$) to tell how, after this vision, the Spirit set him upon his feet and Yahweh said to him, "Son of man, I send thee," etc., which

he might have condensed, and Zechariah did condense, into the brief statement, *After the glory* (vision) *he sent me.** The next following words must now be construed with the verb preceding the parenthesis, and, since in v. $^{13/9}$ Yahweh speaks, not to, but concerning, the nations, the prophet probably intended to say, *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts concerning the nations that plunder you.* He nowhere clearly indicates to which of the nations he refers. The only other hint of their identity is in v. $^{13/9}$, and this is easily misunderstood. It reminds one of the references in Is. 40 *ff.* to Babylon and its cruelty. *Cf.* 47^{6} $49^{24\,f.}$, etc. This, however, cannot be the prophet's thought; for the oppression and deliverance of which he is now speaking are subsequent to the fall of that city. The key to the problem is found in Ezekiel. In chs. 38 *f.* of that book the prophet describes an invasion of "a land restored from the sword" and inhabited by "a people gathered from the nations," meaning Palestine, by Gog, the great prince of the North, at the head of a polyglot horde of plunderers ($38^{6.\,8.\,12}$); but by the help of Yahweh, he says, the chosen people will finally triumph and "plunder those who plunder them." *Cf.* 39^{10}. It is these nebulous followers of Gog on whom Yahweh is about to pronounce sentence.† The decree, however, is again delayed, this time by a reason for it inserted, apparently, by the prophet, *for he that toucheth you toucheth the apple of his* (Yahweh's) *eye.*‡ In other words, it is "the jealousy of Yahweh of Hosts" that "will do this." *Cf.* Is. $9^{6/7}$ Zc. 1^{14} 8^{2}. On the figure, see Dt. 32^{10} Ps. 17^{8}.

13/9. Yahweh, finally permitted to speak, announces his purpose with reference to the nations described. *I will wave my hand over them*, he says. This gesture by the king of Assyria (Is. 10^{32}) denotes a threat; when attributed to Yahweh (Is. 11^{5} 19^{6}), like that of stretching forth the hand, which is a favourite with Ezekiel (6^{14}, etc.), it symbolises the exertion of his omnipotent power. So here, the result being that the nations over whom he waves his hand be-

* Of course, if this clause is a gloss, its value as evidence that in this paragraph Zechariah is the speaker is somewhat diminished. *Cf.* v. $^{10/6}$.

† It is interesting to note that among these nations, according to 38^{5}, were the Persians; but the text and interpretation of that passage being in dispute, it is not safe to lay much stress upon it. *Cf.* Ez. 27^{10}.

‡ Not, as Ki., Bla., *et al.* render it, *his own eye.*

come *spoil for their servants*, especially the Jews. For an extended description of the terrors of that day, see Ez. $38^{17\,ff.}$. Note, also, the parallel passage (Ez. 39^{10}) already cited. At this point there is a slight break in the paragraph. The prophet takes advantage of it to speak for himself and claim divine inspiration. He appeals to the future. He expects that the prediction just made will be fulfilled. When it is, his people, he is confident, whatever they may now think of him, will recognise him as a genuine prophet. *Then*, he says, *shall ye know that Yahweh of Hosts sent me*. This form of appeal is peculiar to Zechariah. See v. $^{15/11}$ 4^9 6^{15}, and compare one very common in Ezekiel, "Then shall ye (they) know that I am Yahweh" ($6^{7,\,10}$), etc.—**14/10.** The prophet takes for granted that his summons will be heeded, and that his scattered compatriots will return to their country. In fact, he goes much further and calls upon the *daughter of Sion* to *sing and rejoice* at the inspiring prospect. First he puts into the mouth of Yahweh the promise, *I will come and dwell in thee*. Here, as in Is. 10^{32} and elsewhere, the daughter of Sion seems, strictly speaking, to be the city of Jerusalem, rather than its inhabitants; hence the rendering *in thee;* but, since in such cases the writer must always have had the people in mind, the exact application of the figure is not of the first importance. The prophet is looking forward to the fulfilment of the vision in which Ezekiel ($43^{1\,ff.}$) saw the glory of Yahweh come from the east and, entering the new temple, fill the whole house; and heard a voice from the house, saying, "The site of my throne . . ., where I will dwell in the midst of the children of Israel forever." The residence of Yahweh in Jerusalem, however, meant more to Zechariah than a splendid spectacle, or even the richest material blessings that he could imagine; for in 8^3 he represents the divine presence as manifesting itself in the transformation of the city into the likeness of his faithfulness and holiness. *Cf.* 8^8.—**15/11.** This is a lofty conception, but narrow withal. The Second Isaiah had taught a larger doctrine, especially in those passages in which he sought to enlist his people in a mission to the world. *Cf.* 42^6 49^6, etc. His teaching found a faint echo in Hg. 2^7. Zechariah boldly adopts it. *Many nations*, he says, as if he were reproducing Mi. $4^{1\,ff.}$, *shall join themselves to Yahweh in*

that day. This means more than the homage, tribute or service of Is. $45^{14\,f.}$ 49^{2} $55^{4\,f.}$. It means, as the next verse clearly teaches, the acceptance of the invitation of Is. 45^{22} and the unlimited extension of the Abrahamic covenant. *Cf.* Is. 44^{5}. *And they,* the other nations, as well as the Jews, the prophet makes Yahweh say, *shall be to him a people.* Zechariah, however, is not a thoroughgoing universalist, for he adds, always in the name of Yahweh, *and he will dwell,* not among them, but *in thee.* In other words, although all nations may now be received into the covenant with Yahweh, he cannot be everywhere worshipped; but—and this is made as clear in $8^{20\,ff.}$ as in Micah—the new temple at Jerusalem is the shrine, and the only one, of the God of the whole earth. It is therefore not strange that in 6^{15} the most remote peoples are to share the labour and honour of rebuilding the sanctuary. This, the attainment of Yahweh's purpose, will also redound to the honour of the prophet, as he, thereby disturbing the course of his own discourse, reminds the reader.

16/12. That the interpretation above given is the correct one, is shown by the way in which Zechariah dwells on the thought of a peculiar relation between Yahweh and Jerusalem. When Yahweh returns, he says, he will *take possession,* or, supplying the adverb from the next clause, *again take possession, of Judah* as *his portion in the holy soil* of Palestine, the rest having been alienated through the fault of Israel, and *again take pleasure in* its capital, and the seat of its sanctuary, *Jerusalem.* *Cf.* 3^{2} Is. 14^{1}.—**17/13.** The return of Yahweh to his sanctuary, as Ezekiel describes it ($43^{1\,ff.}$), is a spectacle calculated to fill the beholder with wonder and reverence. The prophet says that, when he saw the earth aglow with the divine splendour, and heard the voice that proceeded from it "like the sound of much water," he fell on his face. If, as has been suggested, Zechariah had this passage in mind, as he was writing, it was natural that he should close the paragraph by requiring that men should greet with awful attention the great event that he had predicted. The words he uses are an adaptation of Hb. 2^{20}. The first clause, *Silence all flesh before Yahweh,* is virtually a repetition of the original, but the second is recast, the reason for the change being that, while Habakkuk was thinking of God en-

throned in heaven, Zechariah wishes to represent him as issuing, after a period of inactivity (Is. 42^{14}), from his heavenly temple to occupy the earthly sanctuary that his people have prepared for him. Hence he says, not "Yahweh is in his holy temple," but *Yahweh hath roused himself from his holy abode*. On the heavenly temple, see further Dt. 26^{15} Je. 25^{30} Ps. 29^{9}, etc.

That Zechariah was interested in the movement to rebuild the temple appears on the surface of his prophecies; but the casual reader would probably think of him as second to Haggai, both with respect to his zeal for the enterprise and his ability to further it. The study of the first two chapters of his book ought to have shown that any such estimate of him is mistaken. He was thoroughly in sympathy with his (presumably) older contemporary. The thought of the temple dominates these visions throughout. His influence on the more thoughtful among his people must have been greater and more lasting than that of Haggai, because he appealed to that which was noblest in those whom he addressed. His message was, Seek first Yahweh and his vivifying presence, and all these things shall be added to you. An appeal of this sort will bear unlimited emphasis and repetition. It is therefore probable that it was the preaching of Zechariah, rather than that of Haggai, which, after the first enthusiasm had subsided, held the Jews to their sacred but laborious task, during the four years that elapsed before the temple was completed.

10/6. ונסו] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, נוסו.—כארבע] 𝔊, *ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων* = מארבע, which would have no sense with פרשתי in this connection. For the latter, therefore, 𝔊 has *συνάξω* = קבצתי (We.) or אספתי (Che.). If these readings be adopted, as they are by the later critics, the whole clause becomes a parallel to the one that precedes it. But the latter has its proper parallel in v. [11]. This being the case, the one now under consideration may pretty safely be regarded as a gloss and interpreted with the greater freedom. It seems necessary, however, to emend the current text unless it may be supposed that the glossator had in mind 6^{5}, in its present form, and meant to make Yahweh say he had dispersed his people as he was wont to despatch his messengers. The alternative is to adopt a reading, בארבע, found in 23 mss. and several of the earliest edd., and supported by 𝔙 and 𝔖. So Dathe, New. This reading, whether the prep. be rendered *into* (*to*) or *by*, has a familiar sound. In Je. 49^{36} the two ideas are combined. Here the rendering *to* seems the more suit-

able.—On the meaning of פרשתי, see Ps. 68[15/14].—**11/7.** ציון המלטי] 𝕲, Εἰς Σειὼν ἀνασώζεσθε (𝕷) = ציונה המלטי. So We., Now., Marti. The voc., however, is certainly more natural after הוי, and 𝕵 𝕾 𝕿 all have this construction. *Cf.* Je. 22[18].—המלטי] The accent not being thrown back as usual in pause. *Cf.* Ges. § 29. 4 (c) note.—בת] Hi. *et al.* cite Je. 46[19] in defence of this word, but the passages are not parallel, for Jeremiah addresses the people of Egypt, not those who are sojourning with them. This seems a pretty clear case of dittography.—**12/8.** The rendering given to אחר is the only one permissible, the attempts to make it denote aim or purpose being forbidden by Hebrew usage. So AE., who has the excellent paraphrase, "After sending his glory to me he sent me." This explanation renders the emendations of Houb. (אתו כבוד שלחני), Oort (אשר לכבוד שלחני) and Che. (ארץ כבוד שלחך) unnecessary.—כבוד] Better הכבוד.—On אל in the sense of *concerning*, see Is. 37[33] Je. 22[18], etc. The על of 𝕾 𝕿 represents a prevalent mistake with reference to the connection.—בבבת] Some mss. have בבת, a reading that may have been suggested by Ps. 17[8]; where, however, as in La. 2[18], בת is probably a gloss.—עינו is one of the 18 so-called תִּקּוּנֵי סֹפְרִים, or corrections of the scribes, a list of which is given at the beginning of the book of Numbers and again at Ps. 106[20]. Tradition says that the original reading was עיני, but that the scribes, thinking it derogatory to the Deity so distinctly to attribute to him bodily parts, substituted this one. The implication is that the word should be rendered *his own eye*, but this rendering, which has no support in the Versions, except in the *sui* of some mss. of 𝕷 𝕵, is neither necessary nor natural. If, however, the clause is parenthetical, and the natural antecedent of the sf. of this word Yahweh, the tradition above cited is clearly mistaken. See Nu. 12[12], where it is impossible to believe that, as tradition asserts, the original text had אמנו and בשרנו. On the תִּקּוּנִים, *cf.* Gins.[Int.], 347 *ff.*—**13/9.** כי] After the parenthesis this particle introduces the words of Yahweh. *Cf.* Ges. § 157 (b).—לְעַבְדֵיהֶם] Kenn. 96 has לְעוֹבְדֵיהֶם, and this is the reading favoured by 𝕲 𝕵 𝕾 𝕿; but most of the mss.—de Ro. cites 38—and nearly all of the earliest edd. treat the word as a noun. So also Norzi, Baer, Gins., Kit.—The final clause, acc. to Marti, is an editorial addition. His reason for this opinion is that it implies doubt concerning Zechariah's commission, which would hardly have arisen in his lifetime. There are, however, considerations that make for genuineness. This appeal to the future, as has already been noted, is more than once repeated, but not at random. *Cf.* v. [15] 4[9] 6[15]. In every instance it occurs in a passage supplemental to the recital of a vision or other revelation, constituting a feature of such passages. This being the case, if the given passage has the marks of Zecharian authorship, it would seem safe to recognise this feature of it as genuine.—שלחני] Kenn. 150 adds אליכם probably because it, or אליך, appears in all the parallel passages.—**14/10.** רני] On the accent, *milra'*, *cf.* Ges.

§ 67. 8. R. 12 (b).—15/11. לי] Read, with 𝔊 𝔖, לו, and for ושכנתי, with 𝔖, ושכן. 𝔊 has the clearly mistaken, but easily explained, reading *καὶ κατασκηνώσουσιν* = ושכנו, the pl. for the sg.—The whole of v. [15b] is pronounced secondary by Marti, and there is less to be said for the appeal to the future here than in v. [13]; but too much stress must not be laid upon the abruptness with which it is introduced, for in Ezekiel the similar expression, "and ye shall know that I am Yahweh," is repeatedly used with little regard to the connection. *Cf.* Ez. 11[10. 12] 13[9. 14], etc.—17/14. נעור] On the Niph., *cf.* Ges. § 72. 7. RR. 5. 9.—ממעון] 𝔊, *ἐκ νεφελῶν* = מעננו; 𝔙, *de nubibus;* 𝔖[LU] ܡܢ ܡܪܘܡܐ = מרום; but 𝔖[A] = 𝔐.

b. The anointed of Yahweh (3^1–4^{6a} 4^{10b-14}).

The second group consists of two visions. They have to do with the persons and fortunes of the two leaders who represented the Jewish community in the time of Haggai and Zechariah.

(1) THE ACCUSED HIGH PRIEST (CH. 3).

In this vision the high priest Joshua, haled before the angel of Yahweh by the Adversary, is acquitted (vv. [1-5]), and endowed anew with high functions and privileges (vv. [6-10]).

(*a*) *The acquittal* (vv. [1-5]).—The prophet first sees the high priest, as a culprit, before the angel of Yahweh. The latter rebukes the Adversary for his complaint, and then, having released the accused, has him stripped of his soiled garments and clothed in becoming apparel.

1. The same form of expression is used in introducing this vision as in $2^3/1^{20}$, *Then Yahweh showed me.* The place where the scene is laid is not mentioned. One is reminded of similar scenes at the court of heaven; for example, that described by Micaiah, when he was summoned by Ahab to advise him with reference to a projected expedition against Ramoth Gilead (1 K. 22[19 ff.]), in which Yahweh appears seated, "on his throne, with all the host of heaven standing by him on the right and on the left"; but especially of that portrayed in Jb. 1[6 ff.], in which "the sons of God" come "to present themselves before Yahweh," the Adversary among them. In both of these scenes, however, all the persons represented are celestial

beings, while in this one of the principal figures is *Joshua the high priest*.* Moreover, it is not, in this instance, Yahweh before whom the other persons are assembled, but *the angel of Yahweh*, a (or the) manifestation of the Deity in human form, which might be, and, according to various passages in the Old Testament, often was, called a man. So in 1^{8}. Now, since the human form was assumed for the purpose of communion with men, the presence of the angel of Yahweh implies mundane surroundings. Hence, the prophet must have conceived of the scene here described as taking place on earth, and, indeed, in or near Jerusalem. Wherever it was, the angel of Yahweh was, so to speak, holding court, and Joshua was before him.† *Cf.* v. ^{8}. Not in the unfinished temple, as Theodoret and others have supposed, for there the high priest would have been before Yahweh, and hardly in soiled clothing. Present also was *the Adversary*, who was *standing at his* (Joshua's) *right hand*. The rendering *Adversary* is much preferable in this connection to *Satan* (EV.), although the latter is a literal transcript of the original. In fact, "Satan," in the sense in which the modern world has learned from the New Testament to use it, would be misleading; for the conception of Satan as a definite personality hostile to God and the good is the result of a development which had hardly begun when Zechariah prophesied. The process can be traced. Thus, in the first of the two scenes cited the deceiver is not an angel distinguished from the rest by a peculiar title or character, but the one who, when Yahweh asks, "Who shall deceive Ahab?" seems to him to have the best plan for so doing, and goes by divine direction on his mischievous errand. *Cf.* 1 K. $22^{20\,ff.}$. This immediate dependence upon the will of Yahweh makes the latter responsible for all physical evil. *Cf.* Am. 3^{6} Is. 45^{7}, etc. In the book of Job the corresponding figure has acquired a title, "the Adversary," and a sceptical and censorious character. Moreover, he acts on his own initiative (Jb. 1^{7} 2^{2}). Still there are limits to his activity, for Yahweh does not allow him to do serious or irretrievable harm

* For details with reference to him and his office, see Hg. 1^{1} and the comments thereon.

† On the expression *stand before*, of a defendant, see further, Nu. 35^{12} Dt. 19^{17} Jos. 20^{6} 1 K. 3^{16}.

to those who are temporarily placed in his power. *Cf.* Jb. 1^{12} 2^{6}. By the time of the Chronicler the final stage seems to have been reached; for, in 1 Ch. 21^{1}, the title "the Adversary" has become the proper name "Satan," and the character thus designated employs his supernatural faculties to tempt man and thwart the purposes of God. *Cf. EB.* (Gray), art. *Satan;* Smend, *AR.*, 431 *ff.*; Marti, *SK.*, 1892, 207 *ff.*; Toy, *JBL.*, ix, 17 *ff.** The Adversary of this vision is certainly not the malicious power just described. He is more nearly akin to Job's tormentor, but, as will appear, he belongs to another period and performs a different function. The prophet describes him as standing on Joshua's *right hand to accuse him.* There does not seem to be any special significance in the mention of the right hand. The Hebrews frequently used *right hand* in parallelism with (Ps. $21^{10/9}$ $89^{14/13}$ 139^{10}, etc.), or as the equivalent of, unmodified *hand*. *Cf.* Ps. $45^{5/4}$ $48^{11/10}$ $60^{7/5}$, etc. Hence it is best to interpret *at his right hand* here as only a more definite and pictorial way of saying *at his side.* It is clearly so used in Ps. 109^{31}, where Yahweh is represented as standing "at the right hand of the needy" to defend him.

2. The prophet does not go into unnecessary details. He notes the positions of the parties, and leads one to expect that the next thing will be the complaint; but he does not even state that the complaint was brought, much less recite the offence or offences of which the high priest was accused. Indeed, he seems to have intended to convey the idea that the Adversary was interrupted, not, as in the received text, by Yahweh, but by *the angel of Yahweh*, as he was about to present his case. This interpretation certainly harmonises with the tone and apparent intent of the vision as a whole. In any case, the angel of Yahweh silences the Adversary with an indignant objurgation, *Yahweh rebuke thee,* which furnishes another example of the care the Hebrews sometimes took to distinguish between Yahweh and the angel of his presence. *Cf.*

* An idea of the change that had taken place in the views of the Jews on the subject of evil may be obtained by comparing 1 Ch. 21^{1} with the parallel passage 2 S. 24^{1}, where it is not Satan, but Yahweh, who incites David to number Israel. Wright cites Ps. 109^{6} as another instance of the use of שטן as a proper name; but the parallelism shows that it is there a synonym for רשע, *wicked.* For a still more complete doctrine concerning Satan, see Jude [9] Rev. $12^{7\,ff.}$, in both of which passages there is evident allusion to the scene here described.

1^{10} $2^{3}/1^{20}$. The ground of the indignation expressed is found in a mixture of two sentiments that have already shown themselves. The first reappears in connection with the repetition of the just quoted words, where Yahweh is described as the one *who delighteth in Jerusalem*. In other words, it is the partiality for the Judean capital asserted in 1^{14}. The other betrays itself in the question, *Is not this a brand plucked from the fire?* The figure is borrowed from Amos (4^{11}), who used it of the remnant of Israel after one of Yahweh's destructive visitations. The Jewish exegetes find here an allusion to the miraculous escape of the high priest from a furnace into which he and the false prophets Ahab and Zedekiah had been cast by Sennacherib (sic); but there is no ground for believing that he ever had any such experience.* It is probable that the high priest here represents the survivors from the overthrow of Judah, and that the question put into the mouth of the angel of Yahweh, like the declaration of 1^{15}, is an expression of sympathy with them in their excessive suffering. It is as if he had said, "Hath he not already suffered beyond his desert?" *Cf.* Is. 40^{2}.†—**3.** *Meanwhile Joshua, clothed in filthy garments, was standing before the angel of Yahweh.* The filthy garments signify, not grief, but iniquity, as the nature of the figure would lead one to expect and an explanatory gloss in the next verse expressly teaches. The guilt thus symbolised has been supposed to be that of the high priest himself as an individual or an official;‡ but if, as has been shown, he here represents the Jewish people, or at least the Judean community, the garments he wears must be interpreted as setting forth the character and condition of those represented. It is therefore safe to conclude that the prophet in this vision intended to represent Judah as still, in spite of the penalties endured, guilty before God, and so evidently guilty that, as the high priest's silence

* For the details of the story, see Wright, 51 *f*.

† The likeness of the part here taken by the angel of Yahweh to that assigned to Michael in Dn. $10^{13.\ 21}$ 12^{1} naturally led to their early identification. *Cf.* Rev. 12^{10}. Of the later commentators Wright has adopted this view. There is, indeed, a relation between the two figures, but it is not one of identity; the truth being that Michael represents a later development than the angel of Yahweh, and a further differentiation and personification of the powers and attributes by which the Deity was brought into a helpful relation with man. *Cf. DB.*, art. *Michael*.

‡ The Targum says that Joshua "had sons who took to themselves wives unfit for the priesthood."

would suggest, an express accusation was unnecessary and a successful defence impossible. What, then, are the function and significance of the Adversary? The answer to this question must be inferred from the attitude of the angel of Yahweh toward him in his relation to Joshua. Now, in v. [2] the angel of Yahweh is clearly depicted as the protector of the high priest against the Adversary, an attitude that can best be explained by supposing that the function of the latter, in the mind of the prophet, was not to prove so much as to recall the iniquity of the former and insist upon the infliction of the appropriate penalty. In other words, he represents, not, as Marti claims, the doubt and hesitation with reference to the possibility of the restoration of Judah current among the people, but the justice of Yahweh as contrasted with his mercy. The reproof of the Adversary by the angel of Yahweh signifies the triumph of the milder attribute, that is, that Yahweh has determined to save his people, because they are his people and their sufferings appeal to his sympathy, by an act of grace in spite of their unworthiness. *Cf.* Ho. 11^{9} Mi. $7^{8\,f.}$ Is. $43^{25\,ff.}$. It is from this standpoint that the vision becomes, on the one hand, a rebuke to the sceptics of Zechariah's day, and, on the other, a solace for those who, much as they had suffered and were suffering, as they felt, under the divine displeasure, had retained their faith in Yahweh and still cherished an ardent hope that he would speedily forgive their iniquities and rescue them from destruction.

4. The angel of Yahweh, having silenced the Adversary, turns to *those standing before him*,—not, as Blayney explains, the followers of the high priest, but the other members of the heavenly train,—and commands them to *remove* from Joshua *the filthy garments*, the sign and symbol of the people's unworthiness, and *clothe him in robes of state* befitting his office as the religious head and representative of a chosen people. In the Massoretic text these two commands are separated by an interpretative passage, which, however, as has already been noted, is evidently a gloss. It betrays its origin by the disturbance it creates in the order of thought. The interpolated statement, *See, I have caused thy iniquity to pass from thee*, may have been intended to mean that the iniquity was personal. This is the opinion represented by the

Targum, which substitutes for a translation of the Hebrew original a command to the attendants to direct Joshua to "bring forth the wives unfit for the priesthood," that is, unfit to be the wives of priests, "from his house." This interpretation seems to have been suggested by Ezr. $10^{18 \text{ ff.}}$, but, if it is correct, since the passage thus paraphrased is a gloss, it only shows how greatly Zechariah was misunderstood.—**5.** The angel of Yahweh finally commands his attendants to *put a clean turban on his head*. In v. ^{3}, where the appearance of Joshua is described, there was no reference to a turban, but the use of the word *clean* here shows that the prophet did not intend to represent him as without a head-dress. The one named,* which is mentioned only five times in the Old Testament, was worn, not only by priests, but by other persons of rank or wealth, women as well as men. *Cf.* Is. 3^{23} 62^{3}. In Exodus the head-dress of the high priest, which, since it had a related name,† must have been of a similar form, is described as made of fine linen and ornamented with an inscribed plate of gold. *Cf.* Ex. $39^{28. 30 \text{ f.}}$. The rest of the verse describes the fulfilment of the last two commands. In the Massoretic text the order of fulfilment is the reverse of that in which the commands were given; but in the Greek it is the same, and it is more than probable that Zechariah wrote that *they clothed him in goodly garments and put a clean turban upon his head*. The adjective *goodly* is not in the text, but it is required to distinguish the garments now put upon the priest from those that had been removed, and may therefore properly be supplied. It is to be noted that there is nothing to indicate that the garments in which Joshua has been arrayed are official robes, as Drusius and others have held. The emphasis is all on the fact that they are clean, and, as such, signify that Yahweh has for his own sake, "independently of any sacrifice or offering whatever" (Stonard), at last blotted out all the transgressions of his people. The account of the ceremony might have ended with the words last quoted; but the prophet, for the purpose of giving the scene a more vivid reality, adds that, while the attendants were reclothing Joshua, *the angel of Yahweh stood by* to see that his commands were obeyed. *Cf.* Gn. 18^{8} Ju. 13^{20}.

* צניף.

† מצנפת.

1. ויראני] Add, with 𝔊 𝔙, יהוה, as in $1^{28}/2^{3}$. It will then be impossible to make the mistake of supposing, as Blayney, Henderson and others have done, that the subject of the verb is the interpreter. The interpreter explained, but he did not produce, visions.—לְשִׂטְנוֹ] On the vocalisation (*i*), *cf.* Ges. § 61. 1 R. 1.—**2.** ויהוה] Rd., with 𝔖, מלאך יהוה. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**3.** ויהושע וג׳] A circumstantial clause. *Cf.* Ges. § 142. 1 (*b*) R. 1.—המלאך] Rd., with 𝔊ᵠ 𝔖, מלאך יהוה.—**4.** ויען] 𝔖 adds, for the sake of definiteness, ܡܠܐܟܐ.—ויאמר—עונך] A good reason for suspecting the genuineness of these words has already been given in the comments. The truth is that they disturb the connection of thought to such a degree that the situation can easily be made to appear ridiculous; for Joshua is left standing unclothed, not only while the angel of Yahweh makes this explanation, but until the prophet himself has suggested the addition of a turban to his new apparel. Omit this passage, and the rest of the verse can easily be brought into harmony with itself and the context. The final clause, which has been adapted to the gloss, must still be emended, for it also, as appears from v. [5], was originally addressed to the attendants. This can easily be done with the help of 𝔊, which reads, *καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτὸν*, *i. e.*, והלבישו אתו. So also 𝔗. Most mss. of 𝔊 om. מעליך, but L has *ἀπό σου*. It is interesting, as throwing light upon the origin of glosses like the one here found, to note that 𝔊ᴬˡᵈ· and a few curss. have expanded this one into a parallelism:

> *Ἰδοὺ ἀφῄρηκα τὰς ἀνομίας σου,*
> *καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου περικαθαρίζω.*

Van H. removes it from its present position to the end of v. [5].—**5.** ואמר] 𝔙 𝔖 have the 3 p.; but 𝔊 more correctly om., commencing the verse with *καὶ ἐπίθετε*, *i. e.*, not וישימו, but ושימו, without doubt the original reading. So also 𝔗. The removal of ואמר, a corruption of ויאמר, which was inserted to bring the discourse back to the direction of the attendants, makes the following clause, emended as above, a continuation of v. [4], to which it should be attached.—טהור] We. regards the word as superfluous; but the omission of it would affect the meaning of the vision, reducing the emphasis on the previous impurity of the high priest.—וישימו—בגדים] The order of fulfilment, as here described, is unnatural as well as inconsistent with that of the commands given. In 𝔊ᴬᵠ the arrangement is reversed, and the excellence of the Greek readings throughout this paragraph speaks strongly for this one.—בגדים] Add, with 𝔖, טובים, or, with We., טהורים.—עמד] We., *et al.*, point this word as a pf. and connect the whole clause to which it belongs with v. [6]. This method of disposing of the clause, however, is certainly mistaken. (1) The vb. עמד is very rare in the sense of *auftreten*, which these scholars give to it. *Cf.* BDB. (2) The thought that they find in the sentence, if this verb were employed, would have been expressed by ויעמד מלאך יהוה. (3) If,

however, for the sake of emphasis Zc. had adopted the present arrangement, he would hardly have repeated the subject—which We. and Now. suppress—in the following sentence. (4) 𝕾 𝕿 have the participial construction. (5) It is a common one, and there are several cases with the prtc. of עמד. *Cf.* Gn. 18^{22} 1 K. 8^{14} 13^{24}. Of these objections (2) and (5) hold against van H., who attaches v. ^{4ba} to the end of this verse. See above.

(*b*) *The charge* (vv. $^{6-10}$). The angel of Yahweh, addressing Joshua, promises him personally, on condition of loyalty, an exalted position, and his people forgiveness and prosperity.

6. The symbolical ceremony completed, *the angel of Yahweh* turns to Joshua and speaks to him for the first time. The prophet says he *charged* him, that is, addressed him in the solemn manner and language befitting the occasion. *Cf.* Dt. 8^{19}, etc. This expression in itself would lead one to expect an utterance having a personal rather than a symbolical significance.—**7.** This expectation is fulfilled. It does not, however, at first appear that the language used has a personal application. The first condition, for example, *if thou go in my ways*, is one that might be required of any Jew, and therefore of the whole people. Nor is the second, *if thou keep my charge*, really more explicit; for, although the word *charge* oftenest denotes the office or function of the priest, it is also used in the sense of a behest laid upon others by the Deity (Gn. 26^{5} Nu. $9^{19.\,23}$ Lv. 18^{30}, etc.), and the relation between the two conditions requires that it should have the latter meaning in the present instance. There is thus far, then, no certain indication that Joshua has ceased to be a symbolical figure and resumed his personal character. The conclusion, however, removes all uncertainty, for the promise it contains is one personal to him as the high priest. If he is loyal to Yahweh, the God of his fathers, and careful to obey all the divine precepts, this is his reward: *thou shalt rule my house and keep my courts.* The house, of course, is the temple, now being rebuilt, and the courts the enclosures by which, when completed, it will be surrounded. The declaration here made, therefore, amounts to a charter granting to Joshua and his successors a sole and complete control in matters of religion never before enjoyed by the head of the hierarchy at Jerusalem. *Cf.* 1 K. 2^{27} 2 K. $16^{10\,ff.}$

$22^{3\,ff.}$; Benz., *Arch.*, 410. In fact, it is an advance upon the program of Ezekiel (45) in the direction of the priestly legislation of the Pentateuch.* It should be noted, however, that the high priest's jurisdiction is here confined to the temple and its precincts. —To this grant of authority is added another promise of great significance to the community. The passage has been variously understood. In the great versions it is rendered as if it referred to descendants of the high priest.† It has also been interpreted as a promise that Joshua himself shall be given angelic guides to direct and defend him‡ or messengers to keep him in communication with heaven.§ There are, however, reasons, which will appear, why all these interpretations must be rejected and the clause be translated *I will give thee access among those that stand here.* But who are the persons meant? and when shall the high priest enjoy access among them? The first question seems to be answered by v. [4], where, as has been shown, angels are intended. In reply to the second it has been taught that the prophet here has in mind the future life.** Zechariah, however, nowhere else presents any such motive for faithfulness. Hence the chances are that, as most modern exegetes agree, in this case it is the privilege of direct and immediate communion with Yahweh with which he is dealing. This is a privilege not granted all men (Je. 30^{21}), but it may fitly be accorded to a faithful high priest. It is also one that has great significance for the community, as will appear later in the paragraph. *Cf.* v. [9].—**8.** At this point the prophet returns to the symbolic method. Yahweh, addressing the high priest, says *Thou and thy fellows that sit before thee are men of omen.* There can be no doubt that the persons here called the *fellows*, or companions, of Joshua are his associates in the priesthood. The only question is whether Zechariah thought of them as present in his vision. It has sometimes been answered in the affirmative,†† but the description given is certainly calculated to produce the impression that the high

* *Cf.* Ex. $28^{29\,f.}$ Nu. $27^{18\,ff.}$; Benz., *Arch.*, 318 *f.*, 422 *f.*; WRS.[OTJC2], 445 *f.*

† Thus 𝔊, *I will give thee those moving among them that stand by;* which Theod. Mops. explains as meaning that Yahweh will permit Joshua to transmit the honour conferred upon him to successors. Similarly 𝔙 𝔖.

‡ So Cyr., Lu., Grot., Ston., Hd., *et al.*

§ Baumgarten.

** So 𝔗, Ra., Ki., Pem., Dru., Marck, Lowth, Pu., *et al.*

†† So Lowth, Hi., Ew., Brd., van H., *et al.*

priest is a solitary and peculiarly pathetic figure. His associates are mentioned here because they are a part of the priesthood which he primarily represents. On the expression *sit before*, see 2 K. 6^{1}. The description of the priests as *men of omen* recalls a saying of Isaiah, "I and the children that Yahweh hath given me are signs and tokens in Israel." Now, Isaiah in this passage doubtless referred to the names he and his children bore, and their significance. There is no means of learning the names of Joshua's friends. Some, if not many, of them must have had names expressive of faith in God and hope for their people. That of the high priest himself, according to the current interpretation of it, *Yahweh is help*, was practically the equivalent of Isaiah; a fact which in itself was sufficient to suggest to Zechariah an imitation of his great predecessor.* In any case, the idea seems to be that these men, the priests as a class, are prophetic of good to the community they are serving. This thought was not developed as it might have been by Zechariah. A reader of a later time, feeling that it was incomplete, and not taking pains to examine the context, to see if he understood the drift of the passage, added, as a gloss, *for* (or *that*) *I will bring my servant Shoot.*† This is Marti's explanation of the appearance of the Shoot in this connection; and there are good reasons for accepting it. In the first place, as Marti says, for Zechariah the Shoot is Zerubbabel. This, as will appear, was the original teaching of 6^{12}, which has been recast to make it a prediction of the elevation of Joshua. But Zerubbabel was already in Jerusalem; had, in fact, for two months been actively engaged in the restoration of the temple. It was therefore impossible for Zechariah to speak of him as yet to be brought thither by Yahweh. Indeed,—and this is a second point,—there is no place for him in this connection. The prophet is here dealing with the priesthood and its significance. The Shoot represents political power and glory. *Cf.* 6^{13}.—**9.** The omission of the disturbing clause leaves Joshua in the centre of the scene. To him Yahweh now directs especial attention. *Lo*, he says, *the stone that I have delivered to Joshua.*

* *Cf.* also Ez. $12^{6.11}$ $24^{24.27}$.

† The word צמח, here translated *Shoot*, is incorrectly rendered ἀνατολή in 𝔊, and *oriens* in 𝔙; whence the "Dayspring" of Lu. 1^{78}.

The opinions with reference to this stone have been many and various. It has been interpreted as meaning material for the new temple,* the corner-stone† or the topstone‡ of the edifice, the plummet of 4^{10},§ a precious stone for the prince,** or a number of such stones for the high priest.†† To the first four of these interpretations there is the common objection that, according to $4^{7.\ 9\ f.}$, it is Zerubbabel, not Joshua, under whose direction the temple is to be erected, and that therefore it would be inconsistent for Zechariah to represent Joshua as receiving material for the structure or a plummet by which to build it. In considering the second and the third it should also be remembered that the corner-stone had already been laid, and the topstone was not to be put into place until a long time after the date of this vision. An additional objection to the fourth is that the stone in question is to be engraved. The key to the prophet's meaning seems to be in the parenthetical clause rendered in AV. *upon one stone shall be* (RV. *are*) *seven eyes*. But the "eye" of a stone, according to Ez. $1^{16.\ 22}$, is the gleam from it, and, since a gleam can only come from a precious stone, and seven gleams from as many facets of such a stone, the stone in question must have been *a single stone with seven facets*. This is the interpretation proposed by Wellhausen, but he sees in the stone an ornament for Zerubbabel. *Cf.* $6^{10\ ff.}$. To the latter feature there are strong objections: (1) it destroys the unity of the paragraph; and (2) renders the final clause of this verse unintelligible, there being no discoverable connection between the stone, or the name of Zerubbabel, which, according to Wellhausen, was to have been engraved on it, and the promise, *I will remove the iniquity of that land*. It is much better to regard the stone as an ornament for the costume of the high priest, for the following reasons: (1) The paragraph thus acquires the desired and expected unity. (2) The next clause, *I will grave its inscription*, becomes especially significant. The word rendered *grave*‡‡ is used almost exclusively of engraving on precious stones. In Ex. 28, where the costume of the high

* So Stäh., Lowe.

† So Ra., Ki., Marck, Ston., Thei., Rosenm., Hi., Pres., Hd., Wri., *et al.*

‡ Lowth, Mau., Ew., Burger, Stei., Per., Marti, *et al.*

§ AE., Ki. (alt.), Grot.

** We., Now.

†† Bredenkamp.

‡‡ פתח.

priest is described, mention is made of no fewer than fourteen engraved stones, two for the shoulders (v. [9]), and twelve for the breastplate (v. [21]), of the ephod. Now, while it would be unsafe to claim that this chapter describes the ornamentation of the ephod before the Exile, there seems to be reason for supposing that it is reliable so far as the character of the ornamentation of the costume of the chief priest is concerned; in other words, that the head of the priesthood then and afterward actually wore an engraved stone (or stones) on his vestments. (3) The promise already quoted becomes intelligible. On this point, also, the description of Ex. 28 is helpful. In v. [36] of that chapter Moses is directed to "make a plate of pure gold, and grave upon it . . . Holy to Yahweh." There follows (v. [38]) an explanation in which Yahweh says that Aaron shall wear this plate on his forehead in token that he bears "the iniquity of the holy things" offered by his people, "that they (the people) may be accepted before Yahweh." Here, again, it would doubtless be too much to say that the law attributed to Moses reflects the practice even of the time of Zechariah; —the plate of gold seems to forbid such an assumption;—but, if this law, like others in the Pentateuch, is the outcome of the development of the Hebrew ritual, one must suppose that at that date the idea embodied in the law had found more or less adequate expression, and admit the possibility that it is the idea of Zechariah in the passage now under consideration.

Sellin (*Stud.*, ii, 78 *ff.*) cites as a parallel to this vision the record of the installation of a priest of Nebo at Borsippa. It is found in a black stone tablet, 6x8½ in. in dimensions, containing an inscription of a hundred lines. This inscription is to the effect that the goddess Nana and the god Ae have, in their good pleasure, inducted Nabu-mutakkil, son of Aplu-etir, into the sanctuary of Nebo at Borsippa, and granted him a share in the revenues of the temple of Ezida, and, "that the appointment may not be contested, have sealed the same and delivered it to him forever." Sellin further reports that there are engraved on the tablet the figures of the gods who protect the same from violation, and, among these pictures, "in the middle of the narrow upper edge, the seven eyes, evidently a representation of the seven planets, including the moon and the sun." He concludes that in this tablet "we ourselves have a stone with seven eyes similar to that which Zechariah in the vision saw delivered to Joshua." The tablet is published in *Mittheilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, Jan.-Mar., 1900. There can be little doubt that the figures described were intended to represent seven heavenly bodies, but they are not in the shape of eyes, the first being plainly a circle and the third a star inscribed in a circle.

It is hardly safe, therefore, to identify them with the *eyes* Zechariah had in mind, especially since, as the next clause implies, the stone in question was yet to be engraved.

On the supposition that the stone delivered to Joshua was intended for the ornamentation of his official costume, there are one or two other points that should be mentioned. In the first place, the inscription on the stone would hardly be the name of either of the Jewish leaders, but the name of Yahweh, or the "Holy to Yahweh" of later times, or something similarly appropriate. Note, however, secondly, that, while the stone has been provided, it seems, when delivered, not to have been engraved; which probably means that, although Joshua is the chosen head of the religious establishment at Jerusalem, he has not entered into complete possession of his office, for the reason that there is as yet no temple to Yahweh. Meanwhile,—and this would be a strong argument for the speedy completion of the sanctuary,—the land was still suffering for its iniquity. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{9} 2^{14}. When the temple is finished the curse can, and will, be removed *in one day*.—**10.** The iniquity of the land is, of course, the iniquity of the people who inhabit it, inherited in part from their fathers and augmented by their own neglect of the obvious duty of rebuilding the temple, on account of which the land was cursed with drought and unfruitfulness. *Cf.* 8^{10}. When the people, in response to the appeal of Haggai, laid the foundation of the new structure, he promised them the favour of Yahweh. *Cf.* Hg. 2^{19}. Zechariah repeats this promise in $8^{11\,f.}$. He could not, however, guarantee the entire removal of their guilt until the sanctuary was completed. *On that day*, that is, from that day onward, they may expect the continuous blessing of Yahweh. The Hebrews pictured this happy condition as one in which every one would sit "under his own vine and fig tree." *Cf.* 1 K. 4^{25} Mi. 4^{4}. Zechariah enlarges the figure by adding a touch which shows that, as will later become more apparent, he was as much interested in the social as in the economic condition of the community. In the good time coming he says his people will *invite every one his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree*. This idyllic condition is more fully described in ch. 8.

A good example of the method used by the older commentators is seen in Stonard's note on this verse, in which he finds an intimation of "the strenuous endeavours of the apostles and other primitive Christians to convert the heathen world. . . . They are here figured, while resting in the tranquillity and plenteousness of evangelical peace and blessing, as calling to all the wayfaring men who needed such refreshment in the journey through life to partake with them in their ease and comfort in the meat and drink that endure unto everlasting life."

7. צבאות] 𝔖^{A} om.—The accentuation requires that the apodosis of the conditional sentence begin with ונתתי. This is in harmony with the Jewish interpretation of the verse, according to which the final clause is a promise for the future life. So Ki.; also Or., who, since he does not follow the Jewish interpretation, should, with 𝔙 𝔖 and most modern exegetes, place the main pause after the first תשמר. 𝔊 divides the verse after ביתי and reads וגם as if it were ואם, thus wresting asunder two parallel clauses and making a second conditional sentence.—מהלכים] Those who render the word concretely explain it as an Aramaised form of the prtc. Hiph. So Bö. § $^{1013. b}$; Kö. $^{i. 416}$. If, however, the prophet had wished to use the causative of הלך, he would naturally have employed the regular form here, as he does in 5^{10}; and if he had sought an intransitive form, he would have found the Pi. or the Hithp. ready to his hand. *Cf.* Ec. 4^{15}, etc. Ols. § ^{208a} derives the word from a supposed noun מַהְלָךְ. So, also, Ew., Köh., Wri., Lowe, *et al.* This conjecture takes for granted the correctness of the vocalisation. If that be ignored, there is no difficulty in connecting the given form with מַהֲלָךְ which actually occurs in the required sense. *Cf.* Jon. $3^{3\,f.}$ Ez. 42^{4}. The pl., however, would be מַהֲלָכִים. So Sta. § $^{285. 1}$; Ges. § $^{53. 2. R. 5}$. So, also, Marck, Houb., Hi., Klie., Pres., Brd., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.*—8. The accentuation would require that אתה and רעיך be construed as vocatives, and the following כי seems to reinforce this requirement. So 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗. Since, however, as has been shown, there is no ground for supposing the prophet to have thought of Joshua as accompanied by other priests, כי is probably a dittog., and אתה ורעיך are pendent subjects and the antecedents of המה. This pronoun should properly be in the 2d pers.,—and 𝔖 has this reading,—but the use of the third for the second is sufficiently attested to warrant its retention in this instance. *Cf.* Mi. 1^{2} 3^{9}, but especially Zp. 2^{12}; Kö. § $^{344 g. h}$; Dr. § $^{198. Obs. 2}$.—וכי—צמח]. On the genuineness of this clause, see the comments. It is interesting, in view of the rendering given to צמח in 𝔊 𝔏 𝔙 𝔖, that the root from which it comes in Syr. means *shine.* 𝔗 simply substitutes משיחא. On the accentuation of the word, see Ges. § $^{29. 4 (a)}$ R..—9. The accentuation makes v.^{a} a compound nominal sentence, and it has oftenest been so treated. So the Vrss., Dru., de D., Marck, Hd., Köh., Wri., *et al.* If, however, the seven eyes are seven facets, as above argued, the mention of them is of so little impor-

tance in comparison with the announcement that follows, that it should be thrown into a parenthesis. So New., Ew., Ke., Pres., Or., We., Now., Marti, *et al.* The absence of the connective before הנני favours this arrangement.—עינים] The du. for the pl. *Cf.* Ges. § 88. 2. R. On the gender, see Ges. § 122. 2. (c). Here it seems to be masc.; also 4^{10}.—ומשתי] 𝔊, καὶ ψηλαφήσω, 𝔖, ܘܐܡܫܫ, as if from משש, *touch*, *examine*.—עון] 𝔊 prefixes πᾶσαν = כל.—אחד] 𝔖, ܚܕ = ההוא.—10. ביום ההוא] This expression seems to Marti to betray a late hand; but it was common in the literature with which Zechariah was familiar. *Cf.* Is. 4^{1} Je. 4^{9} Ez. 24^{27}. Moreover, it introduces a description of the good time foreseen entirely in accord with ideas of Zechariah. *Cf.* 8^{12}.

(2) THE SYMBOLICAL CANDELABRUM ($4^{1-6a\alpha.\ 10b-14}$).

The fourth chapter, in its present arrangement, does not admit of analysis, but, if vv. $^{6a\beta-10.\ 12}$ be removed, there remains a simple and coherent account of the fifth of Zechariah's visions. In it he sees a lamp with seven lights, flanked by two olive trees, and receives from his attendant an interpretation of the things thus presented.

1. The prophet gives his readers to understand that there was an interval between the fourth vision and the one about to be described, during which he fell into a state of unconsciousness to his surroundings. This seems to have been the case, also, to some extent, after each of the first three visions; for, it will be remembered, he had to concentrate his attention upon, or have it directed toward, each new vision. *Cf.* $2^{1.\ 3.\ 5}$ 3^{1}. The terms here used confirm one in such an inference. ***Then***, he says, ***the angel that was speaking with me again*** (lit., ***returned and***) ***roused me***, that is, for a second, if not for a fourth time. Not that he was asleep, as Aben Ezra and others explain; the comparison he employs, ***like a man that is roused from sleep***, forbids such an interpretation. Perhaps he would have said that he had fallen into a reverie over the things previously revealed. Be that as it may, he was thoroughly alert, as his questions are calculated to show, when the interpreter addressed him.—**2.** In the preceding visions the prophet, when he has spoken at all, has opened the conversation. This time the interpreter is represented as stimulating his curiosity by asking,

What seest thou? In reply the prophet describes *a lamp*, or, more precisely, a candelabrum. It is *all gold* and has *a bowl* for oil *at its top*, that is, at the top of the upright shaft that supports the whole structure. There are *seven lights on it*. The prophet does not say how these lights are arranged, but it is clear that they could not have been placed in a single row, like those of the candelabrum described in Ex. 25[31 ff.], without crowding the bowl out of position.* The simplest and most natural arrangement would be that in a circle about the bowl, on arms of equal length branching at regular intervals from the central shaft, and this is probably the one that the prophet had in mind, since he seems to have thought of the lamp as shedding its rays, not, like that of the tabernacle, in only one direction, but toward all the points of the compass. *Cf.* v.[10b] Ex. 40[24]. The lights themselves must have been very simple,—small, shallow vessels of the shell shape still seen in Palestine,—with a more or less developed lip at the narrower, outer end, from which the wick projected. The lights of the candelabrum of the tabernacle were individual receptacles for the oil they burned. The one that Zechariah saw had *seven pipes for the bowl at its top*, by which this reservoir was connected with the seven encircling lights, and these pipes were independent of the arms on which the lights were supported.—**3.** Finally, there were *two olive trees by it*, not, as in the Massoretic text, by the bowl, for the purpose of supplying it with oil, as the later author who inserted v. [12] also teaches,—an interpretation forbidden by vv. [10b. 14],—but, as in v. [11], by the candelabrum, *one on the right of the lamp, and one on the left of it*. It does not appear whether these trees, also, were made of gold or not. In any case, they were probably but diminutive images of the things they were intended to represent; for it would not have done to make them overtop the candelabrum, as they do in Wright's picture. *Cf.* v. [14].

4. The vision, as just explained, makes a simple and intelligible picture. The object of the prophet, however, was not to entertain, but to instruct. Hence he represents himself as saying to the interpreter, *Sir, what are these?* not the olive trees only, but the various features of the vision. What do they mean?—**5.** Hith-

* See Wright, who places the bowl on an arm extending backward from the top of the shaft.

erto the interpreter has always responded at once to the prophet's desire for information. This time he delays his answer, thus increasing the suspense, by himself asking a question which perhaps implies that the prophet should have been able to discover the meaning of the vision without assistance, *Knowest thou not what these are?* But the prophet protests his ignorance.—**$6^{a\alpha}$.** *Then he*, the interpreter, *answered and said*. These words should introduce the explanation desired by the prophet. What follows is not such an explanation. In fact, it has no apparent connection with the vision, but is a more direct and explicit message on a different subject, received under entirely different conditions. On the first point note the expression, "the word of Yahweh came to me," in v. ^{8}, which is regularly used to introduce messages outside the visions. *Cf.* 6^{9} 7^{4} $8^{1.\ 18}$. On the second observe that, while this vision was evidently intended to strengthen the hands of both the governor and the high priest, in vv. $^{6a\beta-10a}$ the former completely eclipses the latter. On the omitted verses, see pp. 190 *ff*. —**10b.** The reply of the interpreter is not lost. It is contained, as was suggested at the beginning of the chapter, in the latter half of this verse in the words, *These seven are the eyes of Yahweh wandering through the earth*. The seven to which the interpreter refers are, of course, the seven lights on the candelabrum. They take the place of the horsemen on "horses bay, chestnut and white" "sent to traverse the earth," that appear in the first vision, $1^{8\,ff.}$, symbolising, like them, the omniscience of Yahweh. Philo (*Who is the heir of divine things?* xlv.) and Josephus (*Ant.*, iii, 6, 7; 7, 7; *Wars*, v, 5, 5) saw in the lights of the candelabrum in the temple symbols of the planets, including the sun and the moon. Gunkel and others adopt this view, finding here another instance of the same symbolism and in both evidence of the dependence of the Hebrews on the Babylonians.* The difference between them, they say, reflects a variation, otherwise well attested, in the rank of the planets in the Babylonian system; the sun sometimes being placed in the middle, and sometimes at the beginning, of the list.† Now, it may well be that the candelabrum with seven branches had its origin as a symbolical representation of the planets in Baby-

* Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos*, 130. † *Ibid.*, 127.

lonia,—the fact that it did not appear among the Hebrews until after the Exile* seems to favour that opinion;—but it does not by any means follow that, when they borrowed it, they adopted with it the ideas that it had previously represented. A hint of the contrary may be found in the place they gave it in the temple, among the furniture of the ante-chamber of their Deity. *Cf.* Ex. $40^{22\,ff.}$. Note, also, that Zechariah's candelabrum represents, not a multiple subject, but a single personality in the manifold exercise of one of his attributes. It is therefore probable that, if the prophet was conscious of using a symbol for the planets, he thought of them as objects or powers subordinate to, and dependent on, Yahweh, the God of Gods. He certainly gives no hint of their rank as related to one another, for, as has been shown, he must have thought of the lights as forming, not, as Gunkel seems to suppose, a single line, but a circle about the main shaft.

11. The interpreter has thus far confined himself to the candelabrum. The olive trees on either side of it remain to be explained. The prophet therefore asks, *What are these two olive trees on the right of the lamp and on the left?*—**12.** A reply should follow at once, as in the case of the first question, even if the desired information be delayed. In its place the Massoretic text has a second question by the prophet containing elements not in the description of vv. $^{2\,f.}$. In the first place, there are *two branches of the olive trees* to which special attention is directed. The introduction of this detail, in itself, is enough to excite suspicion with reference to the genuineness of the passage. This suspicion is confirmed by the evident divergence in thought between it and the context. The interpolation seems to have been suggested by a mistake concerning the olive trees. In v. ^{14} they are called "sons of oil." The author of this verse, either ignoring the prophet's own explanation, or misunderstanding it, apparently took these trees for the sources of the oil for the lights of the candelabrum. Then, seeing that there was no connection between them and the lamp, he remedied this supposed oversight by describing two branches, one from each of the trees, as ***held by***, lit., ***in the hand of***,

* In Solomon's temple the Holy Place was lighted by ten separate and independent lamps. *Cf.* 1 K. 7^{49}.

the two golden spouts that discharge into the golden bowl. The result is a completely automatic contrivance which probably seemed to the glossator a great improvement on the original, but which, as will appear, really reverses the thought that Zechariah intended to illustrate.—**13.** This verse is the proper and natural continuation of v. [11], corresponding, except in the introductory clause, to v. [5]. On the text, see the critical notes.—**14.** The prophet having again protested his ignorance, the interpreter proceeds to explain the significance of the two olive trees. These trees, then, are symbolical, as well as the lamp. The interpreter says, literally, that they are *sons of oil*. This expression belongs to a class of orientalisms frequent in the Bible. See "son of might," 1 K. 14^{52}, "sons of tumult," Je. 48^{45}, etc. In these cases the person or thing in question is conceived as an example of the state or quality denoted by the dependent noun, the "son of might" being simply a mighty man, etc. In Is. 5^1 a hill is called a "son of fatness," doubtless because it was peculiarly fertile. The phrase *sons of oil*, therefore, would naturally mean producers of oil; but a Hebrew could use it of any thing or person with which or whom oil was associated in his mind. In this case it refers to persons consecrated, as kings and priests were among the Hebrews, to the execution of high functions by being anointed with oil. The interpreter does not tell Zechariah who these two *anointed ones* are, but the prophet had no difficulty in identifying them. Nor has the modern reader. The fact that there are two immediately suggests the names of Zerubbabel, the hereditary prince, and Joshua, the hereditary high priest, both of whom had been, or were to be, anointed for their offices.* The descriptive clause, also, fits them, for in 3^7, it will be remembered, Joshua was promised access to the immediate presence of Yahweh, and certainly Zechariah did not regard Zerubabbel as any less worthy of the divine favour. *Cf.* vv. [7, 9] Hg. 2^{23}. The olive trees, then, symbolise the associated leaders, and their position on either side of the lamp with its seven lights means that they enjoy the special favour, protection and

* Mention should be made of the interpretation adopted by Baumgarten and a few others, according to which these two sons of oil are the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, since it appears to be the basis of the allusion to the olive trees in Rev. $11^{3ff.}$.

assistance of Yahweh, to whom is here ascribed omnipotence as well as omniscience. The effect of such teaching can easily be imagined. It must have greatly encouraged the leaders themselves and greatly increased their influence with their followers, thus doubly affecting the enterprise then in progress, the restoration of the national sanctuary.

1. וישב] On the adverbial use of this vb., see Ges. § 120. 2 (a).—**2.** ויאמר] So 𝔊^{AQ}. An evident mistake. Qr., with a multitude of mss., ואמר. So 𝔊^{NBΓ} 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.—מנורת] The constr. before a dependent nominal sentence. *Cf.* Ges. § 130 (4).—גלה] This form has been derived from a hypothetical גֹּל = גֻּלָּה. So Ki., Mau., Ke., Hd., *et al.*; but, since גֹּל does not occur, and גֻּלָּה does, not only in v. ^{3}, but in Ec. 12^{6}, it is more than probable that a form of the latter was intended. The fact that 𝔊 𝔖 neglect the sf., which, moreover, is not essential, favours the conjecture that the original reading was גֻּלָּה. So Ew., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.* *Cf.* Ges. § 91. 1. R. 2. On the other hand it should be noted that, while to the occidental ear the sf. sounds superfluous, the Hebrews, as a precisely similar passage (Ex. $25^{31\,ff.}$) teaches, preferred to use it. It is therefore better, with 𝔙 𝔗, to follow the Massoretic tradition that the prophet meant to say *its bowl*, but there is no reason for perpetuating the reading גֻּלָּהּ, which is probably a scribal error for גֻּלָּתָהּ.—The adoption of the reading just suggested requires the retention of the sf. of נרתיה, which is reproduced in 𝔙 𝔗, but neglected by 𝔊 𝔖 and therefore omitted by modern critics. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—It requires, also, that מוצקות be made definite, *i. e.*, that ושבעה מוצקות be changed to ושבע המוצקות in accordance with the law for numerals. *Cf.* Ges. § 97. 1.—Thus far no essential change has been made in the text, but now it becomes necessary to do something with ושבעה^{2}. This word has caused "great searchings of heart" among the commentators. Thus Köh. renders שבעה ושבעה *fourteen* and explains this number as meaning that the lights were connected with the reservoir by seven of the pipes, one for each, and with one another by the other seven. This interpretation is rejected by Ke., who shows that, in 2 S. 21^{20} = 1 Ch. 20^{6}, on which it is based, the numerals should be taken distributively. Ston. cites in support of it 1 K. 8^{65}, where, however, as appears from 𝔊, and indeed from v. ^{66}, the words "and seven days, even fourteen days," are an addition to the original text. Ke. says that a lamp constructed on Köh.'s plan would be "a wonderful and useless contrivance," but what should be said of one with seven pipes from the central reservoir to each of the surrounding lights, as required by the critic's own exegesis? Yet this interpretation is adopted by Ra., Ki., Mau., Klie., Pu., Lowe, *et al.*, and followed in RV.

To avoid it Hi. omits שבעה¹, and makes שבעה² a predicate adj. after נרתיה. So Wellhausen. This is, in itself, a permissible construction, but it is doubtful whether the prophet, if he meant to say what Hi. attributes to him, would have brought the numerals in the two clauses into so ambiguous proximity. This objection applies also to the view of Pres., that שבעה² is but an emphatic repetition of שבעה¹. A better method of emendation, and one by which such objections can be avoided, is, with 𝔊 𝔙, to omit the second שבעה, leaving the first and third as attributives before their respective nouns. So Rib., AV., Dathe, Houb., Ew., Hd., Or., Reu., Now., Marti, Kit., van H., *et al.* New., following 𝔊^Comp. 𝔖, would insert the numeral before נרות; but this is forbidden, since לנרות, if the relative clause that follows is genuine, is an error for לגלה.—van H. inserts מן הגלה after לנרות.—**3.** מימין הגלה] This can hardly be the original reading, which must have been either מימין המנרה or simply מימינה. The change was probably made when v. [12] was inserted.—**4.** ואען] On the form, see Ges. § 49. 2 (b); 75. 6. R. 2 (c). 𝔊, *καὶ ἐπηρώτησα* = ואשאל.—**5.** אלי] 𝔊^A om.; 𝔊^ℵBQ add λέγων.—המה] *Cf.* 1⁹.—**6aα.** ויען] 𝔖 om.—לאמר] 𝔖 om.—**6aβ–10a.** The view that these verses are foreign to this connection, suggested by We., is adopted by Now., Marti, GASm., Sellin, Kit. All agree that the passage is from the hand of Zechariah, but Smith thinks it is somewhat earlier, Sellin that it is somewhat later, than the context. For details concerning the text, see pp. 193 *f.* —**10b.** The punctuation of 𝔐 makes שבעה אלה the subject of ושמחו וראו, leaving the first clause of the verse without a proper apodosis. This division is rejected, not only by 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, but by 𝔗 and the leading Jewish commentators, who connect these words with what follows. So, also, Cal., Grot., Pem., Dathe, Lowth, New., Theiner, Ew., We., Now., Marti, *et al.*—משוטטים] The change in the punctuation required by the sense makes this word an adverbial acc., which does not need the art. *Cf.* Nu. 16^{27} 1 S. 2^{18}, etc.; Ges. § 118. 5 (b).—עיני] Masc., as in 3^9.—יהוה] 𝔊^B om.—**12.** ואען] *Cf.* v. ⁴.—שנית] An editorial device to introduce an addition to the text.—מה־שתי] The ש *raphe* with the silent *shewa*. *Cf.* Jon. 4^{11}; Baer, Notes, 82; Kö. ii. 307 f.—שבלי] Fem., with a masc. termination, while צנתרות is masc., with a fem. termination. מריקים is therefore properly construed by 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 with the latter.—צנתרות] 𝔊 *ἐπαρυστρίδας* = מוצקות; 𝔙, *rostra;* 𝔖 [illegible]; 𝔗, אסקרישון; but its connection with צנר, *pipe*, is too obvious to be mistaken.—הזהב] The favourite interpretation for this word is that it is used by metonymy for שמן, *oil.* So, following the Jewish authorities, Dru., Pem., Marck, Bla., Hi., Ke., Pres., Wri., Lowe, Or., GASm., *et al.* Others take the word literally: Klie., *e. g.*, who says, "The lamp itself is represented as arising, developing and growing, and the gold from which it develops and grows flows to it through the spouts," etc. It is only necessary to recall the object of the interpolator to perceive that something is wanting and arrive at a pretty

safe conjecture concerning the words to be supplied. Now, the object was to connect the lights with the olive trees, and, since this could only be done through the bowl, it is necessary that this receptacle be mentioned. The original reading, therefore, seems to have been, not that of 𝕿, (*oil*) *into the lamps of gold* = (שמן) אל נרות הזהב, but (*oil*) *into the golden bowl* = (שמן) אל גלת הזהב. Van H. prefers היצהר למוצקות הזהב.—**13.** לאמר] Om., with 𝕲 𝕾, as in v. ^{2}.—זה] Some (9) mss. add המה, as in v. ^{5}.—**14.** ויאמר] Add, with 𝕾, אלי as in v. ^{2}.

c. *The seat of wickedness* (5^{1}–6^{8}).

The third and final group, like the first, consists of three visions. They have to do with the subject of sin and the purpose of Yahweh concerning it. The first is that of

(1) THE FLYING ROLL (5^{1-4}).

In this vision the prophet sees a flying roll of which he asks the significance. Whereupon the interpreter explains to him that it is a curse sent forth by Yahweh to exterminate the thief and the perjurer from the land.

1. When, after the usual interval, the prophet again lifted up his eyes and looked, he saw *a flying roll*. It was what is elsewhere in the Old Testament called "a roll of a book," or simply a "book." *Cf.* Je. $36^{1\,ff.}$. It was open,—for in v. ^{2} the prophet gives, not only its width, but its length,—presenting, as it passed through the air, the appearance of a great sheet of leather. There was writing on it, too, otherwise it could hardly have had the meaning attributed to it by the interpreter; but whether, like the symbolical book that Ezekiel ate, "it was written within and without," there is no means of determining.—**2.** In answer to the usual question, *What seest thou?* the prophet further describes the roll by giving its apparent dimensions; *whose length is twenty cubits and its width ten cubits*, or, roughly speaking, thirty by fifteen feet. These figures are the same as those for the area of the porch of Solomon's temple. *Cf.* 1 K. 6^{3}. Hence, some of the commentators, Christian as well as Jewish, have supposed that they were intended to recall that structure and through it teach an important religious lesson; but,

unfortunately, the most ingenious among them has not been able to furnish an interpretation that is sufficiently obvious to commend itself to any one but the inventor. It is therefore hardly probable that Zechariah had the porch of the temple in mind when he wrote this description, or, if he had, that he adopted its dimensions for any other reason than that they appealed to him as a sort of standard for size and proportion. The Holy Place in the tabernacle, it will be remembered, had the same dimensions. *Cf.* Ex. $26^{1\,ff.}$.* —**3.** The interpreter, without waiting to be requested so to do, now explains to his charge the meaning of the roll. *This*, he says, *is the curse that goeth forth.* This explanation, as already intimated, is intelligible only on the supposition that the roll contained more or less writing. Nor can there be any doubt about the character of its contents. Ezekiel (2^{10}) says of the one that appeared to him that "there were written therein lamentation, mourning and woe." This one, as Zechariah conceived it, was doubtless inscribed with a curse, or, it may be, a series of curses. *Cf.* Dt. $27^{15\,ff.}$. The Hebrews, as appears from Nu. $5^{23\,ff.}$, attributed the most baleful effects to such instrumentalities.† The prophet, taking advantage of this superstition, represents the penalty for sin as an inscribed curse that executes itself upon the offender, seeking him wherever he may be, *over the face of the whole land.* The mission of the curse marks a new departure in the divine administration. Hitherto it has apparently been too lenient; *for every one that stealeth, —how long now hath he gone unpunished?* The thief is cited as an example, and *the one that sweareth falsely* as another. These two represent the two great classes to one or the other of which sinners may be referred, those who have injured their neighbours and those who have dishonoured their God. See the two tables of the covenant. None of these has in times past received his just deserts, and, because sentence was not speedily executed, they have all been confirmed in their evil ways. *Cf.* Ez. 8^{11}.

4. Thus far the interpreter has been speaking in his own person. He now introduces an utterance of Yahweh in which is described

* It is this sacred area, according to Ke., Klie., Brd., Wri., from which the figures were borrowed.

† The modern inhabitants of Palestine have the same fear of written curses. *Cf.* Hanauer, *Tales Told in Palestine*, 138 *f.*, 220.

the fatal effectiveness of the winged curse. When it comes to the house of one of the offenders *it shall abide in his house and consume*, *i. e.*, until it has consumed, *it with its wood and its stones.* The complete destruction of a house, of course, implies the destruction of its inmates. *Cf.* Am. 3^{15}.*

In the comments on v. ^{3} it was noted that the mission of the curse was a new departure in the divine administration, and the words of the prophet were quoted to show that, for one thing, the change meant an increase in severity toward sinners. That, however, can hardly be the whole of the lesson that the vision was intended to teach. A hint of something further is found in the fact that the prophet represents the curse, not only as commissioned to destroy, but as attacking the sinner in his own house. The doctrine thus suggested is one that, when Zechariah was prophesying, had been more or less boldly professed among the Jews for at least a hundred years. There had been a time when they could, and did, believe that a family or community might justly be punished for the sin of any of its members;† but later they first doubted, and finally repudiated, the doctrine.‡ The great problem of the Exile was the reconciliation of the new view, in its turn, with the facts of experience. It was during this period that some one sought to comfort his fellow-captives by making a new application of Gn. $8^{21\,f.}$. "This," he represents Yahweh as saying, "is like the matter of Noah to me; for, as I swore that the water of Noah should not again pass over the earth, so I have sworn that I will not (again) be wroth with thee or rebuke thee"; that is, again inflict such a penalty as the one they were then suffering. The prophet Zechariah seems to have had the same thought. The gist of the teaching of the vision, therefore, is that Yahweh will not again punish the Jews as a people by any such universal calamity as the Exile, but will henceforth inflict upon each individual sinner the penalty for his personal offences. In other words, it is an announcement,

* The lesson of this vision has a parallel in the story of Glaucus as told by Herodotus (vi, 86, 3). That story is to the effect that, when Glaucus inquired at the Delphian oracle whether he might safely perjure himself to avoid restoring a sum of money that had been placed in his keeping, the priestess replied, "Oath hath a nameless son, who, though handless and footless, swiftly pursueth until, seizing, he destroyeth a whole race and an entire house."

† *Cf.* Jos. $7^{22\,ff.}$ 2 S. $24^{10\,ff.}$, etc.

‡ *Cf.* Je. $31^{29\,f.}$ Ez. $18^{1\,ff.}$ Dt. 24^{16}.

so far as the Jews are concerned, of an era of individualism. Compare van Hoonacker, who thinks the vision refers to the past.

1. ואשוב] *Cf.* 4¹. 𝔖ᴬ om.—מגלה] 𝔊, here and v. ², δρέπανον = מַגָּל; Aq. Θ, διφθέρα; 𝔗, *falcem*.—**2.** מגלה עפה] Acc. to Kö., § ⁴¹⁰ᵉ, an object clause, *a roll flying*.—באמה] This idiom alternates with that without the prep. in P., 1 K. 6 *f.* and Ch., but it is used elsewhere only here and in Ez. 40⁵· ²¹ 47³. In Ges. § ¹³⁴· ²· ᴿ· ² for "otherwise" rd. elsewhere.—**3.** מזה כמוה] The words are variously rendered by the Vrss., but there is no reason for supposing that even 𝔊 (ἕως θανάτου) had a text different from 𝔐. The meaning depends on the force of נקה. This vb. has usually been regarded as a prophetic pf. and translated *will be punished* (𝔊 𝔙, Dru., *et al.*), *cut off* (Ki., de D., New., Mau., *et al.*), *swept away* (Pres., Or., *et al.*), *purged out* (Marck, Hi., Köh., Ke., Pu., Wri., *et al.*), etc. There is, however, no warrant for such a rendering. The word is a Niph. from נקה, *be clear* (𝔖, ܢܩܐ), and since to say that the thief and the perjurer shall go unpunished (Lu.) would evidently not be the prophet's idea, the only alternative is to translate, with Ra., *hath gone unpunished*. So We., Now., Marti. Houb. rds. נקם. If, however, the vb., as a proper pf., refers to the past, there is ground for the suspicion that, as We. was the first to suggest, מזה כמוה is a corruption of מזה כַּמָּה, or better, the זה כַּמָּה, *already how long*, of 7³. So Now., Marti, Kit.—הנשבע] Since, according to the Law it was not a sin to swear (Gn. 22¹⁶ Dt. 10²⁰), but only to swear by other gods than Yahweh, or by him to a falsehood (Dt. 6¹³ ᶠ· Lv. 19¹²), it is plain that the original text must have had בשמי לשקר here as well as in the next verse. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—כמוה²] 𝔊ᴮ om.; but the omission is without significance.—**4.** הוצאתיה] Three mss. have והוצאתיה. So 𝔊, καὶ ἐξοίσω, but wrongly, for the curse has already gone forth.—ובאה] Pf. with ו in the sense of the impf. after a pf. *Cf.* Ges. § ¹¹²· ᵠ ⁽ᵃ⁾.—ולנה] With ֵ in a toneless syllable instead of ִ. Here only; Ges. § ⁷³· ²· ᴿ· ¹. Dathe rds. לָנָה.—וכלתו] For וכלתהו. *Cf.* Ges. § ⁷⁵· ²· ᴿ· ¹⁹.—ואת] The ו is explicative. *Cf.* Ges. § ¹⁵⁴· ⁿᵒᵗᵉ ⁽ᵇ⁾.

(2) THE WOMAN IN THE EPHAH (5⁵⁻¹¹).

In this, the seventh vision, the prophet sees an ephah which, when the cover is lifted, is found to contain a woman symbolising wickedness. She is thrust back into the measure and two other women with wings bear her away to deposit her in Babylonia.

5. This paragraph is sometimes connected as a supplement, or

further development, with the preceding, and the number of visions thus reduced to seven.* Zechariah, however, notwithstanding his partiality for the perfect number, does not seem to have meant that it should be so treated. If he had, the interpreter would hardly be represented as returning to the prophet, as if after an absence, and, when he *came forth*, reappeared, commanding his charge to *lift up* his eyes *and see*, just as at the beginning of the other visions. *See*, the angel says, *what this is that cometh forth*, presents itself as a new object of attention. Whence it came the prophet does not say, and it seems idle to conjecture. Certainly not, as some have held, from the temple, for at this time there was no temple.—**6.** The prophet does not at once recognise what it is at which he is looking. Hence his question, *What is it?* The interpreter is obliged to give it a name. It proves to be *an ephah*. The ephah, like the bath, according to the latest authorities in such matters, contained 36.44 litres, that is, 32.07 English, or 38.86 American quarts.† A receptacle of this size would hardly satisfy the requirements of the vision. It is probable, therefore, that the prophet intended to represent the object in question, not as an ephah, but as something of the same cylindrical shape, and not noticeably larger than the familiar measure.‡ The text has a second answer to the prophet's question; but, because it is a second answer and anticipates, not only the explanation in v. [8], but any mention of the woman to whom it refers, it is clearly out of place in the present connection. It must therefore be a gloss to v. [8], inserted here by a careless copyist.—**7.** This verse is not a continuation of the speech of the interpreter.§ If it were, there would be no need of the introductory *And he said* at the beginning of the next. Moreover, it is not properly explanatory, but merely descriptive of the ephah and its content. The prophet now sees for himself that the measure is covered by *a disk of lead*. When this disk, whose weight is calculated to excite curiosity, is *lifted* enough to permit one to look within, but not so far as to allow anything to escape, it appears that there is *a woman*, lit., *one*

* So Ke., Klie., Wri., Or., *et al.*

† *Cf. EB.*, art. *Weights and Measures*; Nowack, *Arch.*, 202 *ff.*

‡ So New., Ston., Köh., Or., *et al.*

§ So de D., Köh., Pres., Lowe, *et al.*

*woman, sitting in the ephah.** By whom the lid was lifted the prophet does not take the trouble to inform the reader. It can hardly have raised itself (Brd.), but was probably lifted by the interpreter, since, according to v. ^{8}, it was he who put it back into its place.

8. This woman, the interpreter now explains, is *Wickedness*. The term is unmodified, except by the article, as required by Hebrew usage. This is probably the reason the author of the gloss in v. ^{7} felt moved to explain it. His explanation, however, is not very helpful, the word *iniquity* being quite as inclusive as *wickedness*. Those who regard this vision as supplemental to the preceding naturally claim that the prophet is here speaking of sin in general, which is to be banished from Judah, but permitted to continue its destructive work in Babylonia; but this view makes both visions teach too nearly the same lesson. There is a better one, namely, that the prophet here has reference more particularly to idolatry.† It is favoured by several considerations: (1) Idolatry is a form of wickedness to which the Hebrews were always addicted, and for which they believed both of their kingdoms had been punished, first with minor calamities, and finally by overthrow. *Cf.* Je. $44^{20\,ff.}$ Ez. $23^{1\,ff.}$. (2) It was practised by the inhabitants of Palestine, including some of the Jews, even after the Exile. *Cf.* Ezr. $9^{1\,ff.}$ Is. $57^{3\,ff.}$ $65^{1\,ff.}$ 66^{17} Mal. 2^{11}. (3) It is frequently in the Old Testament represented as the evil especially offensive to Yahweh. *Cf.* Dt. 4^{25} $17^{2\,ff.}$ 1 K. $21^{25\,f.}$, etc. (4) It is the form of offence that a Hebrew prophet would most naturally think of banishing. *Cf.* Dt. 4^{15} 1 S. 26^{19} Am. $5^{26\,f.}$. (5) Ezekiel foretold that on their restoration his people would be cleansed from it. *Cf.* $33^{22\,ff.}$ $37^{21\,ff.}$. If Zechariah actually had idolatry in mind, it is easy to explain why he represents it as a woman. In so doing he simply follows the practice of the older prophets, who repeatedly denounce this offence under the figure of prostitution. *Cf.* Ho.

* Pressel thinks that the picture presented in the vision as above explained is an "awkward" one. He therefore suggests that this verse be rendered, "*And lo, a hundred-weight of lead was carried, the same being carried by a woman who sat in the ephah.*" *De gustibus*, etc.!

† So Ston., Hd. Jerome in his commentary uses the expression, "*iniquitas, quam alio nomine idolatriam possumus appellare*"; but this is probably an allusion to Col. 3^{5}.

$2^{2\,ff.}$ Je. $23^{1\,ff.}$ Ez. $16^{1\,ff.}$, etc.*—The woman here pictured is a very active figure. No sooner is the cover lifted from the ephah than she attempts to escape. The interpreter, however, intercepts her, *thrusts her* back *into the ephah and casts the leaden weight upon its*, not *her*,† *mouth*.—**9.** When the woman Wickedness has thus been securely imprisoned in the ephah, the prophet sees *two* more *women coming forth*. Much ingenuity has been expended in attempts to discover their significance. The outcome is a great variety of opinions, some of which are diametrically opposed to one another. Thus, for example, Köhler finds in them messengers of Satan, Neumann angels of Yahweh.‡ They are probably to be regarded as the necessary adjuncts of an effective picture.§ They have *wings like the wings of the stork*, that is, long and strong ones, suitable for rapid and prolonged flight. Storks are very common in Palestine. When they are migrating they pass over the country by thousands, and during this season the fields are often thickly dotted with them. A full-grown stork of the larger, and commoner, white variety measures more than three and a half feet in length and twice as much from tip to tip of its black wings.** Mounting on such wings, these two women *bore the ephah* containing Wickedness *up* and away *between heaven and earth*. The last phrase, like the "in heaven" of Je. 8^7, is an allusion to the fact that the stork always flies very high in its migrations.

10. The prophet, whose curiosity is now fully aroused, inquires, *Whither are they moving the ephah?* He says *the ephah*, but, of

* On this point it is of interest to note further that the word here used for wickedness (רשעה, *rish'ah*) is a favourite with Ezekiel; that in 2 Ch. 24^7 the idolatrous queen Athaliah is called "the wickedness" (המרשעת); and that the consonants of the root from which both of these names are derived are found in the reverse order in Ashtoreth (עשתרת), Bab. *Ishtar*, the name of the most popular of the false divinities by whom the Hebrews were seduced from their allegiance to Yahweh. *Cf.* 1 K. 11^5 2 K. 23^{13} Je. 7^{18} $44^{15\,ff.}$.

† So Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Ra., Rosenm., Wri., *et al.*, who do not seem to have seen the ridiculousness of throwing such a mass of lead at so small a mark.

‡ Neumann's comment on this passage is a good example of his florid style of exegesis. He says, "How full of surprising beauty is the thought in this simple picture! The women who go forth from the Lord to banish Godlessness raise themselves on bright pinions, wings full of love and kindness, wings that care for their own with loving faithfulness and with a devoted passion of inspired watchfulness."

§ So New., Mau., Brd., Or., *et al.*

** Tristram (*NHB.*, 246 *f.*) seems to teach that the date at which the storks appear in Palestine is always in the latter part of March. This, however, is not correct. At any rate, in 1903 immense flocks of them passed over Jerusalem on the ninth of that month.

course, it is the woman rather than the measure in whose destination he is interested.—**11.** The interpreter does not, strictly speaking, answer the question put to him, but replies as if the prophet had asked, not whither, but why, the winged women were moving the one in the ephah, saying, *To build for her a house.* The proper interpretation of v. ^{8} sheds great light upon this passage, for, if Wickedness is the personification of idolatry, the house to be built is probably not an ordinary dwelling, but a temple more or less imposing. Now, it is an interesting fact that the Babylonians called their *zikkurats*, the towers of from three to seven stories which they erected in honour of their deities, houses. Thus, the one at Nippur they named "*E-kur,*" the house of the mountain, the one at Agade, "*E-an-dadia,*" the house reaching to heaven, the one at Babylon, "*E-temen-an-ki,*" the house of the foundation of heaven and earth, etc.* These *zikkurats* were the most noticeable feature of the great cities. *Cf.* Gn. $11^{1 ff.}$. When, therefore, the interpreter adds that the house is to be built *in the land of Shinar*, the question naturally arises whether it is not to be one of these *zikkurats*. There certainly is nothing in the passage to forbid such an inference.—Finally, the interpreter says that *when it*, the house, *is prepared*, lit., *set up*, *they*, presumably the women, *will deposit her*, with the ephah in which she is now confined, *there in her place*, lit., *upon her base.* Here, perhaps, is an allusion to the little room or shrine, which stood on the platform at the top of the *zikkurat*.†

There is nothing in the vision as above interpreted incongruous with the teaching of other and earlier Hebrew writers. The purification of the Holy Land from idolatry, as has been noted, was predicted by Ezekiel. That the false deities should be deported, and not destroyed, is in harmony with the doctrine taught in Dt. 4^{19} $29^{25/26}$, according to which the worship of other gods was permissible in foreign countries. That their destination should be Babylonia is not surprising when one remembers how long the capital of that country had been the centre of the heathen world. *Cf.* Rev. 14^{8}, etc. To be sure, Babylon had now lost her suprem-

* *Cf.* Jastrow, *RBA.*, 638 *ff.*
† *Cf.* Jastrow, *RBA.*, 621 *f.*; Peters, *Nippur*, ii, 122.

acy. Of this the prophet is perfectly aware. Hence he does not stop with the deportation of Wickedness, but adds another vision to the series. Compare van Hoonacker, who refers this vision also to the past.

5. מה] So 𝔊^{Nc.a L} 𝔖^{H}; 𝔊^{N*ABQF} om. We. would add האיפה. That, however, would make the question a request for information, which should come from the prophet. *Cf.* 1^{9} $2^{2}/1^{19}$. This is a parallel to the "What seest thou" of 4^{2} 5^{2}. Marti, followed by Kit., substitutes האיפה for מה. Both suggestions are based on the assumption that v. $^{6b\alpha}$ is an interpolation. It is not v. $^{6b\alpha}$, however, but, as has already been noted, v. $^{6b\beta}$, that is the interpolation. Consequently the present reading in this verse may be retained.—היוצאת] The gender conforms to that of the word understood. Strictly rendered, the question is, *Who is this goer-forth?* Cp. Ct. 3^{6} 6^{10}, where the prtc. is used adverbially.—**6.** ויאמר¹—היוצאת] The whole is omitted by the later critics. If, however, the rest of the verse is omitted, this part must be retained as an answer to the preceding question.—האיפה] *An ephah*, although it has the art. *Cf.* Ges. § 126. 4. Acc. to de D. the prtc. has the art. because it is construed with זאת.—For the reasons for regarding ויאמר² וג׳ a gloss to v. ^{8}, see the comments.—עינם] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, עונם. So Houb., New., Bla., Burger, Hi., Fürst, Or., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.*—**7.** וזאת] 𝔖 om. זאת. Rd. והנה, with 𝔊 𝔙, Dathe, New. and the later critics, or better, וארא. Cp. Ges. § 126. R. 2. note.—אחת] Not, as Kö., § 291d, teaches, the equivalent of the indefinite art., but a numeral emphasising the solitariness of the subject. *Cf.* Gn. 22^{13} Ex. 16^{33}, etc.—**8.** אבן] 𝔊^{L}, τὸ τάλαντον = ככר. —אל] Better, with 𝔖, על.—פיה] It is impossible to tell by inspection whether the sf. refers to the ephah or the woman, but as already intimated, a little reflection ought to result in a decision for the former alternative.—**9.** Some mss. begin here a new section.—ורוח בכנפיהם] This clause has all the marks of a gloss. (1) It interrupts the natural flow of thought. (2) It introduces an incidental reference to wings before the statement that the women were provided with them. (3) It betrays, in the masc. sf. of כנפיהם, a more careless hand than that of the original author, who takes pains to use the proper gender in referring to the women. *Cf.* להנה. For these reasons it is best explained as a marginal gloss, suggested by Ez. $1^{20\,f.}$, which was inserted into the text by a thoughtless copyist. It would be less noticeable if it followed the next clause.—החסידה] 𝔊, ἔποπος; 𝔙, *milvi*; 𝔗, נשׁרא; Aq. ΣΘ, ἐρωδιοῦ.—ותשׂנה] Rd., with many mss., ותשׂאנה. *Cf.* Ges. § 74. 2. R. 2.—**10.** המה] Rd., with Kenn. 250, de R. 545, הנה.—מולכות] Rd., with many mss., מוליכות.—**11.** לה] *Raphe* before an accented syllable. *Cf.* Ges. §§ 23. 4; 103. 2 (a).—והוכן] We., after 𝔊 (καὶ ἑτοιμάσαι), ולהכין. Now. and Kit. omit it as a dittog., but the resemblance between it and the next word is not suf-

ficiently close to warrant such a disposition of it. Moreover, it makes good sense with בית for a subject. On the construction, see Ges. § 112. 5 (e). Van H. rds. הַכַּר for אַכַּר, *Akkad*. *Cf.* Gn. 10^{10}.—וְהֻנִּיחָה] A mongrel form for which there is no reasonable defence. Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, וְהִנִּיחָה. So Klo., Or., We., Now., Marti., Kit.—מְכֻנָתָהּ] Elsewhere the word has ו even in the pl. with sfs.

(3) THE FOUR CHARIOTS (6^{1-8}).

In this, the eighth and last, vision the prophet sees four chariots, each with horses of a peculiar colour, equipped for the cardinal points, whither they are finally despatched. Especial attention is called to those that have gone northward, as having assuaged the spirit of Yahweh in that region.

1. When next the prophet lifts up his eyes he sees *four chariots*.

The Hebrews did not have chariots in the earlier centuries of their history. Their country was so rough that they could not use them to advantage at home and they were not strong enough to venture on military expeditions beyond their own borders. *Cf.* Ju. 1^{19}. When, however, they became united and powerful under David, they began to be more aggressive, and, coming in contact with peoples who used chariots, they added this feature to their equipment. *Cf.* 2 S. 8^4 1 K. $10^{26\,ff.}$.

The fact that chariots were almost exclusively used in war made them a symbol for strife and bloodshed. Is. $22^{6\,f.}$ Zc. 9^{10}. The appearance of chariots in this vision, therefore, leads one to suspect that, to the Jews, it signified war and destruction for some of the neighbouring nations. The chariots are represented as *coming forth from between* (*the*) *two mountains*. Where these were, the prophet does not tell his readers. They can hardly have been Moriah, the temple hill, and the one either to the west* or the east† of it, since he describes them as *mountains of bronze*. There is a hint of their location in v. ^{5}, where the interpreter speaks of the chariots as coming forth from the presence of Yahweh. The natural inference from the two passages combined is that these mountains were ideal mountains in front of the abode of Yahweh. *Cf.* $2^{17/13}$. Perhaps, however, Zechariah gave them some such ap-

* The one often incorrectly called Zion. So Dru., Marck, Mau., Pres., *et al.*
† The Mount of Olives. So Ki., Pu., Wri., Brd., Or., *et al.*

pearance as that of the hills with which both he and his readers were familiar. So Marti. If the Greek reading, "mountains" for "myrtles," in 1[8. 11] is correct, the scene of the first vision was probably the same that is here described, and equally imaginary.

The prophet seems here to be borrowing from a popular mythological representation according to which the approach to the dwelling of the Deity was guarded on either side by a brazen mountain. Had the brazen pillars, Jachin and Boaz, in front of Solomon's temple (1 K. 7[15 ff.]) any connection with these fabled mountains? It seems possible even if, as W. R. Smith (*Sem.*, 468 *ff.*) maintains, these pillars were originally used as "altar candlesticks," like those in front of Phœnician sanctuaries.

—**2** *f*. Each of the chariots was drawn by horses, probably, since this was the custom in Egypt and Assyria, two in number,* which differed in colour from all the others. The first had *bay*, the second *black*, the third *white* and the fourth *spotted* (or *speckled*) *horses*. On the significance of these colours, see vv. [6 f.]. There is no reference, here or elsewhere, to drivers for these horses. They, like the horsemen of the first vision, seem to be taken for granted.

4. The prophet makes the usual inquiry, *Sir, what are these?*—**5.** The great Christian Vrss. agree in rendering the first words of the reply to this question, *These are the four winds of heaven*, and many of the commentators have adopted this translation,† citing Ps. 104[4] in support of it. The passage cited, however, is not to the point. The Psalmist, it is true, says that Yahweh makes "winds his messengers," but the prophet employs the expression *the four winds*, which, with or without the addition *of heaven*, is a familiar designation for the cardinal points of the compass. Thus, in 1 Ch. 9[24] the four winds are defined as "the east, west, north and south. See also Ez. 37[9] 42[20] Dn. 8[8]. There is only one passage outside this book in which it is used in any other sense, and that (Je. 49[36]), being later than Zechariah,‡ was probably influenced by a mistaken interpretation of this passage. There remains the paren-

* According to Jerome these teams were quadrigæ, but he probably had no better authority for this opinion than his Jewish teachers, who doubtless, like AE., got it from 1 K. 10[29], where the price of a chariot is that of four horses.

† So Marck, Mau., Hi., Köh., Klie., Brd., Or., Reu., *et al.*

‡ Giesebrecht.

thetical statement in $2^{10/6}$, which, however, unless emended as suggested, must be pronounced another example of the same sort. The expression used, then, indicates that the prophet was not thinking of the winds themselves, much less of spirits,* but of the principal points from which the winds blow. This being the case, it is necessary to translate, with Kimchi, *These to the four winds of heaven are going forth.*† This rendering is confirmed by other considerations, the most weighty of which is that, in the following verses, where the interpreter is evidently developing the statement here made, his language implies that the four winds are the four directions in which the chariots are going. Its adoption relieves the reader from the necessity of supposing that the prophet is here using figurative winds to explain imaginary chariots instead of making the chariots, or their drivers, agents of Yahweh corresponding to, but not identical with, the horsemen of the first vision. The prophet does not here give the destinations of the several chariots, but he informs the reader whence they have come. They are *going forth from standing before*, that is, from the presence of, *the Lord of the whole earth;* from whom they have received instructions concerning their movements. They are now awaiting a command to depart, each on its mission.

6. In the preceding verse it was the chariots that were prominent. From this point onward it is, and necessarily, the horses; there being no way to distinguish the chariots except by the colours of the animals attached to them. Note also that the order in which the teams are mentioned is not the same as in vv. 2 *f.* There the bay horses came first; here the black ones lead. There seems to have been no reason for the first arrangement, for the Hebrews had no stereotyped order for the points of the compass. *Cf.* Ez. $42^{16\,ff.}$ 1 K. 7^{25} Nu. $34^{1\,ff.}$ 35^{5}, etc. The change was probably made because the black horses are the only ones that receive further mention. *Cf.* v. [8]. In this case one can also see a significance in their colour. The Hebrew word for the north‡ indicates that it was conceived as a dark and gloomy region. Hence it is fitting that *the black horses* should be assigned to *the north*

* So Cal., Lowth, New., Hd., Pu., *et al.*
† So We., Now., Marti.
‡ צפון (*ṣaphon*), *dark.*

country; which is here, however, not the remote north, but, as in 2[10/6], the region of Babylonia. The same cannot be said of the second pair, *the white ones*. Indeed, there is a difference of opinion on the point of the compass to which they are to be despatched. The text has a word that is generally rendered *after them*. It is probable, however, that this should be translated *to the west of them*, or emended so that it can be so rendered. It might then be interpreted as referring to Asia Minor and Europe, the home of the fair peoples. *Cf.* Gn. 10[2 ff.].* *The spotted ones* go to *the south country*, but why, there seems to be no means of discovering.†—**7.** The statement with reference to the fourth team has been only partially and imperfectly preserved, but it can easily be recovered. The horses, of course, should be, not, as the Massoretic text has it, *the strong*, but *the bay ones*, since they are the only ones whose destination has not been given. Moreover, the statement that they *shall go forth* should be followed by an indication of the direction, which, now that all the other points have been pre-empted, must be that of *the east country*. *Cf.* Gn. 25[6].‡—Thus far the interpreter. The prophet adds that the horses, as is the manner of spirited animals, all *sought to go to traverse the earth*, or the parts assigned to them; that some one, who can hardly have been the interpreter, finally gave the command, *Go traverse the earth;* and that, in obedience to this command, *they traversed the earth*. *Cf.* 1[10 f.].

There is an interval between this scene and the incident described in the next verse. The length of the interval it is difficult to determine. The prophet can hardly have meant that the chariots, with their horses, not only disappeared, but actually traversed the earth before anything further happened within the sphere of the vision. At any rate, he proceeds as if almost immediately, while he was yet gazing after them, the same person who had given the command dismissing them addressed him.—**8.** Now, the prophet

* The only son of Yepheth (*Japheth*) whose name at all resembles the word for *white* (לבן, *labhan*) is Yawan, the progenitor of the Greeks, and in this case the resemblance is hardly close enough to justify suspicion of an attempt at paronomasia.

† The Hebrew word for *spotted* (ברוד, *barodh*), to be sure, has an inverse likeness to one for *the south* (דרום), but, if the prophet had this word in mind, it is strange that he did not use it in place of the one (תימן, *teman*) found in the text.

‡ The Hebrew word for *red* (אדום, *'adhom*) is from the same root as Edom.

would not have put such a command into the mouth of any one but Yahweh. Hence, it is probably Yahweh of whom he here says, *he called and spake to me*. This inference is supported by the following considerations: (1) The introduction of Yahweh as a speaker, though unexpected, is not unlike Zechariah. In the first vision, it will be remembered, the Deity interposed with comforting words for the encouragement of his servant. *Cf.* 1^{13}. (2) The prophet says that the speaker, whoever he was, *called* in the sense of *cried*, when he spoke, that is, spoke in a loud voice. This implies that he was at some distance and points to Yahweh, who, according to v. ^{5}, was within the sacred precincts before the entrance to which the prophet saw the chariots. (3) The prophet cannot have intended to represent the interpreter as saying of the horses that had gone to the north country, *they shall assuage my spirit in the north country*. This is admitted by Marti and others, who, however, instead of adopting the obvious alternative, change the text to give it the form of a speech by the interpreter. The emendation suggested is ingenious, but, as has been shown under (1) and (2), it is unnecessary and, indeed, inadmissible. The speaker, then, is Yahweh, and the spirit, or, as Ezekiel* puts it, "the wrath" assuaged is his wrath. But why should Yahweh be angry with the north country alone or vent his anger only upon that region? This question is answered by van Hoonacker by saying that the prophet here again, as in $2^{1}/1^{18\,ff.}$, reminds his people of the past, and this time of their deliverance from the Babylonians by Cyrus.† The following considerations, however, make it more probable that he is thinking of the future: (1) The fact that the first three visions dealt with the past, and the next two with current interests, would lead one to expect that in the last three the author would make further progress. (2) The sixth and seventh, as has been shown, are capable of an interpretation in harmony with this expectation. (3) The teaching of the prophet in this series of visions would be incomplete without a glimpse into the future of Wickedness. (4) He would naturally find in the second revolt of the Babylonians against their Persian conquerors, which occurred

* *Cf.* 5^{13} 24^{13}, etc.
† So also Sellin, *Stud.*, ii, 87 *f.*

about this time, an occasion for the display of the continued displeasure of Yahweh.

1. מרכבות] On the vocalisation of the sg. see Ges. § $^{93. 48 (b)}$.—הררים] Better, with 𝔊, הרים. So Houb.—**3.** ברדים] Σ Θ, *πελιδνοί*.—אמצים] Om. with 𝔖. The omission of the art. is significant. How the word got into the text it is difficult to imagine, unless it is a corruption of המוצים, a synonym of אדמים (Is. 63^{1}) taken from the margin of v. ^{2}. *Cf.* v. ^{7}. In its present position it is meaningless. Houb. rds. צבעים, in the sense of parti-coloured.—**5.** המלאך] Add, with 𝔊 𝔖^{H}, הדבר בי.—אלי] So 𝔊^{L}; om. 𝔊^{NABQΓ}.—ארבע] Rd., with We., *et al.*, לארבע, or better, since in v. ^{6} אלי is used to indicate destination, אל ארבע. Note, also, that it is easier to explain the omission of אל than of ל after אלי אלה.—יוצאות] The predicate of אלה representing מרכבות. The accentuation, therefore, is incorrect. השמים should have *pashta*.—מהתיצב] 𝔊 𝔙 om. the prep.; 𝔖 both it and יוצאות.—**6.** אשר בה] Bla. ingeniously suggests that a ו be prefixed to the relative and both words thus attached to v. ^{5}; but it is better to explain them as a mistaken addition which defeats the prophet's purpose, viz., to bring the horses with their colours into prominence, יצאים] The context requires that this prtc. have the force of an impf. It follows that יצאו in both cases should be replaced, as in 𝔖, by the prtc., or, as Ew. suggests, be pointed as the impf. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{112. 1. R. 2}$.—אל אחריהם] These words would naturally be translated *after them*, but, so rendered, they are unintelligible in this connection, owing to the improbability that the prophet would represent two chariots as having the same destination. We. infers that the text is corrupt, and suggests אל ארץ הקדם. If, however, as he himself admits, one of the chariots was despatched to the west, this seems to be the place to find a statement to that effect. Ew. claims that the present text may be so rendered, but his explanation is not entirely satisfactory. The sf. of אחריהם refers, not to the white, but to the black horses. Hence the destination of the former is west, not of the starting-point, but of the region to which the latter have gone.—**7.** האמצים] Rd., with 𝔖 Aq., as in v. ^{3}, האדמים. The text seems to have been corrected to make it conform to v. ^{3}. So Dathe, Houb., Hi., Ew., Pres., Or., Marti, *et al.*—יצאו] Here also rd. either יצאים or יֵצְאוּ, and add, as the destination of this team, אל ארץ קדם. *Cf.* Gn. 25^{6}. Now. supplies אל ארץ העבר, Kit. אל ארץ מעבר.—ללכת] Om. 𝔊^{L} 𝔖^{H}. להתהלך] Twelve Kenn. mss. rd. והתהלך. So 𝔊^{AQΓ}.—**8.** ויזעק] 𝔊^{B}, *καὶ ἀνεβόησαν*.—אתי] Om. with 𝔊 𝔖. The usual construction is אלי, which follows the co-ordinate vb.—הניחו] We. would rd. יניחו, and the fact that both 𝔊^{B} and 𝔖 have a connective here seems to favour this; but, since the pf. is frequently used for the impf. of acts that are imminent, a change in the text seems unnecessary.—רוחי] Marti, who insists that the speaker can only be the interpreter, sees in י an abbreviation for יהוה.

d. The prince of Judah (6^{9-15} $4^{6a\beta-10a}$).

The rest of ch. 6, although it has a certain connection with the visions, falls outside of the series. This is clear from the formula with which v.[9] begins. The instruction here given is received, not through pictures explained by a third person, but directly from Yahweh. The same is true of 4^{6a-10a}, which, as has been shown, is foreign to its present context, but which finds a more suitable setting after 6^{14}. The only objection to this arrangement is that there seems to be little connection between these two passages and the preceding context. On the other hand, they would quite naturally follow the fifth vision. It is possible, therefore, that 5^1–6^8 once preceded the third chapter. In either case these passages would close the first division of Zechariah's prophecies, forming two paragraphs. The subject of the first is

(1) A SYMBOLIC CROWN (6^{9-14}).

The prophet is instructed to take with him certain persons to the house of Josiah, the son of Sephaniah, and there fashion a crown and predict the appearance of the Messiah.

9. The prophecy is introduced by the familiar formula, *Then came the word of Yahweh to me. Cf.* 4^8 7^4 $8^{1.18}$. In the third and fourth of these passages "Yahweh of Hosts" takes the place of "Yahweh." The implication is that the message came soon after the last vision; but, since the visions, as has been explained, are but literary forms, the point is of no importance.—**10.** It is important that this verse be correctly understood, but not easy in the present form of the text to discover the prophet's meaning. The very first words provoke discussion. The prophet is directed to take something *from the captivity*. At once two questions arise: Who—for it evidently consists of persons—are the captivity? and What is it that is to be taken from them? The word rendered *captivity* commonly refers to exiles in Babylonia. *Cf.* Je. 29^1 Ez. 1^1, etc. In the book of Ezra, however, "the captivity," or

"the children of the captivity," means those who have been in exile but have returned to their country (4^1 9^4, etc.), and this is the interpretation that best suits the present context. But what is it that Zechariah is directed to take from these returned exiles? In the next verse the object of the verb is "silver and gold," and, as it is taken for granted that the prophet is there simply repeating the thought here expressed, the commentators generally supply the same object in this connection. There are, however, objections to such an interpretation. In the first place, if the prophet really intended to say what he is supposed to have said, he could easily have arranged the sentence so that the verb and its object would come together, and this would have been the natural arrangement. The fact that he did not adopt this arrangement casts suspicion upon the interpretation suggested. Secondly, if the prophet in v. ^{11} had intended to repeat for emphasis or any other purpose the thought of this verse, he would not have said "take silver and gold," but "take from them silver and gold." The clause, as it now reads, attaches itself, not to what precedes, but to what follows. *Cf.* Is. 47^2. These considerations make it necessary to look elsewhere for the object of the verb *take*. It can only be found in the first three names given. As Blayney says, "The prophet is not required to take silver and gold from the persons named, but to take them." True, the text must be emended to bring these names into direct subordination to the verb; but, since it is agreed that emendation cannot be avoided, and since the changes required by this interpretation are less radical than those that have been proposed, this is not a serious objection. The reading recommended is, *Take from the* (returned) *captives Heldai, and Tobiah, and Jedaiah.* Neither of these persons is mentioned in the Old Testament outside of this passage. *Cf.* v. ^{14}. The further instructions given to the prophet, so far as they are contained in this verse, with slight modifications, read, *and come with them to the house of Josiah, the son of Sephaniah, who* (also) *hath come from Babylon.* Rosenmüller suggests that the Sephaniah (Zephaniah) here mentioned may be the "second priest" put to death by Nebuchadrezzar after the destruction of Jerusalem (2 K. $25^{18\,ff.}$); but, as that was nearly seventy years earlier and there is

no intimation that Josiah belonged to the priesthood, this suggestion is improbable.*

11. The question now arises why the prophet was directed to take the three persons first mentioned to the house of the fourth. There are three possible answers. The first to suggest itself, and the one that the reviser would probably have given, is that Heldai and his companions were to furnish the gold and silver for the work in hand; but, if this were correct, the materials would have been mentioned in v. ^{10}. There is more to be said for the supposition that, as Josiah seems to have been a goldsmith who had a home and a shop in Jerusalem, the other three were of the same trade, but, being among the recent arrivals, had not yet established themselves in the city. The idea is that they were all to be employed to *make a crown*, that it might be the sooner completed, also that they might share the honour of having made it. This, however, is pure hypothesis. A more reliable explanation (Blayney) is that Zechariah took these men with him as witnesses to the symbolic act that he was about to perform.† Isaiah ($8^{1\,ff.}$), at the command of Yahweh, took witnesses when he posted his prophecy of the destruction of Israel and Syria, and Jeremiah ($32^{11\,ff.}$) when he wished to publish his faith in a future for his country. If, therefore, Zechariah took means to preserve and transmit the memory of his predictions concerning Zerubbabel, he was only doing what the greatest of his predecessors had done.—The Massoretic text represents the prophet as further commanded to place the crown, when completed, *on the head of Joshua the son of Jehosadak the high priest*. This, however, cannot have been the original reading; for, if he had fulfilled this command, at the same time pronouncing the words he is here instructed to speak on the occasion, he would in so doing have contradicted his own teaching and Haggai's, which clearly was that the Messianic prophecies were fulfilled in Zerubbabel, and that it was he who should *build the temple of Yahweh*. *Cf.* $4^{7.\,9}$. If, therefore, a name was mentioned here, it must have been that of Zerubbabel. Perhaps, as Wellhausen maintains, the latter half of the verse entire is an addi-

* See further, on the Zephaniah of 2 K. $25^{18\,ff.}$, Je. 21^{1} $29^{25.\,29}$ 37^{3}.
† So also van Hoonacker.

tion; which means that the prophet left it to his readers to supply the name of Zerubbabel. The present reading is a clumsy attempt, by an anxious scribe, to bring the prophet into harmony with history. Neither Zerubbabel nor any other descendant of David ever again ruled as king in Jerusalem, but, in process of time, the high priest became the head of the entire community. It is this condition of things, unforeseen by Zechariah, which the changes in the text were intended to justify.*

12. The crown was expected to create a sentiment for independence and stimulate effort toward its achievement. The explanation that follows is calculated to emphasise its significance. *Lo, a man*, says Yahweh, *whose name is Shoot*. There was a similar announcement in 3^8, but, as the appearance of the Shoot in that connection seemed unnatural, the discussion of his identity was postponed. The word first occurs as a Messianic term in Is. 4^2, where, however, it is an appellative denoting the marvellous produce of the Holy Land under the blessing of Yahweh. In Je. 23^5, on the other hand, it is used of a scion of the house of David with a well-defined character. The prince so named "shall deal wisely, and execute justice and righteousness in the land." It is evident that Zechariah had this latter passage in mind, his Shoot being expressly called a man. *Cf.* Je. 33^{15}.—There follows a clause that has been variously understood. There are those who take it impersonally, finding in it a prediction of prosperity like that in Is. 4^2,† or of the rise from the man in question of a flourishing dynasty;‡ but there are objections to both of these views. (1) It is doubtful if the compound word which would be literally translated *from under him* can properly be interpreted as meaning either *under his reign* or *from his root.* (2) The following verbs all have personal subjects, and the one in this clause would naturally have the same construction. Those who construe it in this way, however, differ in their interpretation of the rest of the clause, the question being whether it refers to the region from which the Shoot will spring,§ his lineage** or his condition.†† The difficulty in this

* *Cf.* Wellhausen, *IJG.*, 149 *ff.*

† So Lu., Mau., Hi., Ew., Pres., *et al.*

‡ So We., Now., Marti.

§ So Ki., Dru., *et al.*

** So Ra., Pem., Rosenm., Burger, Köh., Klie., Ke., Wri., Brd., *et al.*

†† So Marck, Pu., Or., *et al.*

question arises from the fact that most of those who have attempted to solve it, ignoring the context, have taken for granted that the prophet is looking into the remote future, in fact predicting the appearance of Jesus of Nazareth. Now, it is only necessary to consider that there is but one definite thing that the Shoot is expected to do, namely, to *build the temple of Yahweh*, to see that he must be a contemporary of the prophet, and when one again remembers that this is precisely the task which in $4^{7.9}$ is assigned to Zerubbabel, it becomes clear that this passage is simply a recognition of him as the Messiah. If, however, Zerubbabel is the Shoot, the prediction that *he shall shoot* can, under the circumstances, have nothing to do with the place of his birth or his lineage, but must refer to a rapid rise from a comparatively humble position to one of greater prominence and influence. Hence, the whole clause may be rendered, *Upward shall he shoot.* The result is more important than at first appears; for, if the interpretation proposed is correct, the clause is a mere play on the name *Shoot*,* the thought of which is more worthily expressed in the proper connection in the next verse. In other words this clause, like the next one, which is wanting in the Greek and Syriac versions, is an interpolation.

13. The removal of the interpolated clauses brings the introduction of the Shoot into immediate connection with the more suitable of the two statements with reference to his mission at the beginning of this verse. *He*, says Yahweh, emphasising the subject, *shall build the temple of Yahweh.* Not that the governor has thus far had no hand in the work. The expression here used must be interpreted in the light of $4^{7.9}$. Thus interpreted it means that he will complete the task on which he and his people have now for five months been engaged. Thereafter *he shall assume majesty*, attain the rank and honours of royalty, not, apparently, at once, but ultimately, as his reward for building the temple of Yahweh. Then he shall *sit and rule on his throne*, exercise the various functions of a king.—Now, before the Exile the king was supreme in Judah, not only in civil and military, but in religious matters. He controlled the temple and its services; the officiating priests, like

* Sellin finds here a play, not only on *Shoot*, but on the actual name of the governor, in Babylonian *Zir-babili*.

the soldiers on guard, being his servants. *Cf.* 2 K. $16^{10\,ff.}$ $21^{6\,ff.}$ $22^{3\,ff.}$, etc. When the community was reorganised after the captivity, the religious interests being predominant, the priests naturally acquired a considerable degree of authority. In the vision of the lamp ($4^{12\,f.}$) Zechariah recognises this change by giving to Joshua equal importance with Zerubbabel as a servant of Yahweh. In this passage, also, although he promises the crown to the latter, he makes ample provision for the former, for it is Joshua whom he has in mind when he says that *there shall be a priest on his* (Zerubbabel's) *right hand.* This is as clear as that Zerubbabel is the Shoot. There is, therefore, as little need of supplying here the name of the high priest as in v. [11] that of the governor. The position at the right hand of the king means power and honour second only to those enjoyed by the monarch. But two persons so nearly equal are liable to become jealous of, and in the end openly hostile to, each other. The prophet does not anticipate any such rupture between Zerubbabel and Joshua. *There shall be peaceful counsel between the two;* they will plan in perfect harmony for the best interests of those whom they have been divinely chosen to govern.—**14.** There is nothing to indicate that, if Zechariah was instructed to crown Zerubbabel, he was to leave the token of future authority in the governor's possession. He would naturally make some other disposition of it. It is doubtful, however, if this verse in its present form correctly represents him. Not that there is anything suspicious in the idea of preserving the crown as *a memorial,* even *in the temple of Yahweh.* There exposed, it would serve as a reminder to disheartened patriots of the glorious things it symbolised. It is strange, however, that it should be described as a memorial to Heldai and his associates. This implies that they furnished the materials for it,* a thought which, as has been shown, was imported into v. [10] by a reviser. It is therefore probable that this verse, or at least the names it contains, are by the same hand.†—The omission of this verse leaves the question of the disposition of the crown unsettled. Perhaps it was never made. The prophet does not say that it was; and, if he did, there would still be room for doubt whether he meant to be understood literally; for, although

* *Cf.* Ex. 30^{16} Nu. 31^{54}.

† *Cf.* Now., Marti, Kit.

in some instances it may be taken for granted that the action described was performed,* Je. 13[1 ff.] is an exception, and there may be others in which the narrative is only a parable.†

9. The removal of 4[6a-10a] from its place in 𝔐 leaves this the first clear case of the use of the introductory formula, *Then came the word of Yahweh to me.*—**10.** לקוח] The inf. abs. for the imv. *Cf.* Je. 32[14]; Ges. § 113. 4 (b) a. Perhaps, however, since 9 Kenn. mss. have לקח, the imv. should be substituted for the present reading.—מאת] In the sense of *out of*. *Cf.* 14[17].—מחלדי] The emendation suggested in the comments requires את חלדי, and ואת, instead of ומאת, before each of the other names. For חלדי van H. rds. חרים. *Cf.* Ezr. 2[39]. These names are all treated as appellatives in 𝔊, מחלדי being rendered by παρὰ τῶν ἀρχόντων, מאת טוביה by παρὰ τῶν χρησίμων αὐτῆς, and מאת ידעיה by παρὰ τῶν ἐπεγνωκότων αὐτήν; but some mss. (𝔊L) add a second, correct rendering of 𝔐.—ובאת[1] We. rd. ומאת and omits all between it and יאשיה. Similarly Now., Marti, Kit. It is difficult, however, to explain ובאת[2] except as a dittog. Besides, ובאת[1] is needed with אתה, for which the original seems to have been אִתָּם. *Cf.* Ex. 17[5]. So Houb. On the tense of ובאת, see Ges. § 112. 5 (c) ζ.—ביום ההוא] The phrase is unintelligible in this connection.—באו] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗, בא, the subject being Josiah. It was not necessary to say that the other three had come from Babylon. So Houb.—The verse, as above emended, reads, לקוח מאת הגולה את חלדי ואת טוביה ואת ידעיה ובאת אתם בית יאשיה בן צפניה אשר בא מבבל. This may not be a perfectly correct restoration of the original text, but it is so great an improvement, both linguistically and exegetically, on the traditional reading that there can be no disadvantage in provisionally adopting it.—**11.** עטרות] Rd., with 𝔖 𝔗, עֲטֶרֶת. So Theod. Mops., Houb., Bla., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.* The same mistake is found in Jb. 31[36].—ושמת] Perhaps for ושמתה.—As already explained in the comments, the name of Zerubbabel must be substituted for that of Joshua or v. [b] entire omitted, the latter being the more defensible alternative. So We., Now., Marti, Kit. The attempt of van H. to emend by substituting לפני for בראש is not commendable.—**12.** אליו] If v. [11b] be omitted, this word must also be dropped or changed to אליהם. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—לאמר[1.2] The word is not needed after אמר. It is therefore omitted in these chapters, except in this passage and another (7[9]) in which it is clearly an interpolation. So 𝔊 𝔖.—The reasons for regarding this verse from ומתחתיו onward as of secondary origin, so far as they are exegetical, have already been given. There is one further point that deserves mention in this connection. The speech beginning with this verse was evidently meant to be peculiarly rhythmical, but its symmetry is disturbed by the words

* *Cf.* 1 K. 22[11 f.] Is. 20[1 ff.] Je. 19[1 ff.] 27[2], etc. † *Cf.* 11[4 ff.] Ez. 4[1 ff.] [4 ff.] 5[1 ff.] 12[1 ff.].

in question.—At first sight it seems impossible to tell whether it is the last clause of this verse or the first of the next that should be dropped. 𝔖 favours the former, 𝔊 the latter, of these alternatives. The use of the emphatic pron. הוא, a frequent means of connecting clauses in Heb., at the beginning of v. [13] speaks for the genuineness of the clause that follows. *Cf.* Ju. 13⁵, etc.—היכל] 𝔊, τὸν οἶκον. So also in vv. [13. 14. 15]; in 8⁹ only, ναός.—**13.** כהן] 𝔗, כהן רב. Ew. supplies יהושע. So also We., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit. The prophet no doubt had the high priest in mind, but he did not need to say so, and the absence of the art. with כהן is proof that neither Joshua's name nor his title was mentioned.—על כסאו] Rd., with 𝔊 (ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ), על ימינו.—**14.** A sufficient reason for believing that this verse is not from the hand of Zechariah has been set forth. The variations in the names from those in v. [10], if they could be shown to be intentional, would be significant.—והעטרת] This word, in spite of the fact that 36 mss. have והעטרות, like the עטרות of v. [11] should be pointed as a sg. See תהיה; also 𝔊 𝔖. 𝔗 has תשבחתא = מזמור, a musical term found in the superscriptions of many psalms. *Cf.* Ps. 3¹, etc.—לחלם] There seems to be no ground for supposing, with AE., *et al.*, that Heldai had a second name, or, with Ew., that his name was changed. It is therefore probable that 𝔖 is correct in reading here, as in v. [10], *Heldai*. So Houb., New., Bla., Köh., Or., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.* In 1 Ch. 11³⁰ the same name is corrupted to חלד, and in 2 S. 23²⁹ to חלב. Van H. here, as in v. [10], rd. חרים.—ולחן] Many, following 𝔊, render the nominal part of this word as an appellative. So Theod. Mops., Theodoret, Mau., Hi., Ew., Köh., Klie., Ke., Brd., Wri., Or., GASm., *et al.* Others explain it as another name for Josiah. So AE., Ki., Dru., Pem., Lowth, Rosenm., *et al.* Still others, with 𝔖, rd. ולאשיה. So Houb., New., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.* The objection to this emendation is that it is easier to explain 𝔖 than to understand how 𝔐 could have been mistaken for it. This objection would not hold against ולבן for ולחן בן, an alternative suggested by Houb., or against ולהם ולאשיה, from which both 𝔖 and 𝔐 might easily have arisen. On ולהם, see Ges. § 124. note (b). Van H. om. ולחן בן צפניה entire.—בן] 𝔊^AQΓ, τοῖς υἱοῖς = לבני; a palpable error.

(2) ZERUBBABEL AND THE TEMPLE ($4^{8-10a.\ 6a\beta-7}$ 6^{15}).

Zechariah receives a second message, in which the governor is assured of the divine assistance and promised ultimate success in the difficult task of rebuilding the ruined temple. The prophet is so confident of his inspiration that he stakes his reputation on the fulfilment of this prediction.

8. On the introductory formula, see 6^9.—**9.** In the preceding paragraph, as has been shown, the central figure was originally Zerubbabel. Here, also, the high priest is ignored. It is *the hands of Zerubbabel* that *have laid the foundation of this house*, the prophet declares. He doubtless means to give the governor credit also for the whole conduct of the enterprise since its inception. Moreover, he expects him to continue to direct it; he says that *his hands shall finish it*. This prediction is punctuated by an appeal to the future first found in $2^{13/9}$, which, although it seems superfluous at this point, may yet, as was said in commenting on $2^{15/11}$, be genuine. Indeed, it is difficult to understand why any one else than the prophet should have added it.—**10a.** The prediction concerning the completion of the temple implies the prevalence of doubt among the Jews on the subject. They knew that their available resources were slender, and they felt so deeply that Yahweh was displeased with them that they hardly dared expect his assistance. The prophet understands the situation. When, therefore, he asks, *Who hath despised a day of small things?* he does not mean to reproach them. The question, in its very terms, admits the complaint. It *is* a day of small things. *Cf.* Hg. 2^3. The prophet also takes for granted that they who have most deeply felt their poverty would most gladly rise above their circumstances. He is trying to help them. To this end he pictures a time when they shall see and, of course, as loyal Jews, *rejoice to see, the plummet in the hand of Zerubbabel*. The thought is perfectly intelligible, and, on the supposition that vv. $^{6a\beta-7}$ are to follow, perfectly appropriate in this connection. The governor is represented as a builder. The plummet in his hand is not only the sign of his calling, but an indication that he is actually engaged in the practice of it. To see him, therefore, with the plummet in his hand is to see the walls of the temple, now hardly begun, rising from day to day under his direction. Thus, the verse marks a stage between the beginning and the end of the work that Yahweh has commissioned him to do.—**6aβ-b.** At this point there is need of a warning. There is danger lest the flattering assurance that the prophet has just uttered should defeat its own object by making Zerubbabel think more highly of himself than he should or inducing his people to put too great confidence

in human ability. To prevent any such mistake the prophet introduces *another word of Yahweh*, not to, but concerning, Zerubbabel, *Not by force, and not by strength, but by my Spirit.* Not that, on the other hand, he intends to teach that in the present instance there is nothing to do but trust in Yahweh. He merely wishes to remind his compatriots that, as Haggai also taught (2^5), the surest guarantee of success in the undertaking they have at heart is the presence of the divine Spirit in their midst. It is hardly necessary to say that, since this passage is not properly a part of the vision of the lamp, the attempt to establish a parallel between the Spirit and the oil in the lamp by Köhler and others is mistaken and fruitless. —**7**. The prophet expects the condition of success to be fulfilled. Hence, he believes, as he said in v. ^{9}, that the temple will be completed. He recognises that there are difficulties, but he does not consider them insurmountable. *Who art thou, great mountain?* he cries, apostrophising them; *before Zerubbabel become a plain*, disappear! *then shall he*, or that he may, *bring forth the topstone with shouts, Grace, grace to it!* The word here rendered *grace* may mean beauty as well as favour, acceptance. *Cf.* Pr. 1^9 17^8, etc. Hence, the cry with which the topstone is greeted has been interpreted as an expression of admiration, *It is beautiful, beautiful!** This interpretation, however, would imply that the stone was different in kind from the rest in the building, or very richly ornamented, an assumption for which there does not appear to be any authority. It seems better, therefore, to suppose that the prophet meant to represent the people as showing their interest in the occasion by appealing to Yahweh to bless the ceremony of laying the last stone with success and thus setting the seal of his acceptance upon the completed sanctuary.—**6^{15}**. There remains the last verse of ch. 6, which, or a part of it, will serve as a conclusion to this paragraph. It seems to have been left where it stands because it contains no reference to Zerubbabel, and therefore does not betray the reviser of the preceding verses. It adds a thought necessary to the completion of Zechariah's picture of the restoration of the sanctuary. Haggai (2^7) predicted that all the nations would bring their treasures to enrich it. Zechariah has not hitherto said anything so definite on the subject, but

* So Ra., Now., *et al.*

in $2^{15/11}$ he foretells that many nations will attach themselves to Yahweh, and this prediction warrants one in supposing that he expected the nations to assist the Jews in their enterprise, and in attributing to him the prophecy, *they shall also come from afar and build on*, assist in building, *the temple of Yahweh*. *Cf.* 8^{22}. There follows a fourth appeal to the future which provides a fitting close for the paragraph. The rest of the verse is but a fragment of a sentence, having no connection with what precedes, which appears to have been copied from Dt. 28^{1}.

In the paragraph on the symbolic crown no account was taken of 6^{15}. The reason for neglecting it was that no connection could be found between it and the preceding context. It has, however, features in common with $4^{6a\beta-10a}$. For example, it not only deals with the subject of the temple, but contains a repetition of the appeal to the future found in 4^{9}. It is therefore at least possible that the two passages belong together, that, in fact, $4^{6a\beta-10a}$ once occupied the place now only partially filled by 6^{15}. But $4^{6a\beta-10a}$ apparently consists of two parts which for some reason have been transposed. If, therefore, these verses be given the new setting, the order will be 4^{8-10a}. $6a\beta$-7 6^{15}. Thus arranged the three fragments yield a very satisfactory sense.—**8.** The Massoretes recognised the significance of the formula here used by beginning a new paragraph with this verse.—**9.** יסדו] This word has always been treated as a Pi. pf., but Sellin (*Stud.*, ii, 92 *f.*) makes it a Qal impf., like יצר for ייצר, overlooking the objection that if the prophet had meant to use the impf. he would have put this as well as the next vb. into the proper gender.—הבית] Rd., with 10 Kenn. mss., את הבית.—חבצְּנָה] On the retention of ַ in pause, see Ges. § 29. 4 (a) R..—וירעת] Rd., with 3 Kenn. mss., 𝔊ᴸ 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗., וידעתם. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**10a.** מי] The question is equivalent to a condition. *Cf.* Ex. 24^{14} Ju. 7^{3}, etc. It may, therefore, properly be followed, as it is in this instance, by the pf. with ו. *Cf.* Ges. § 112. 5 (a) ζ.—בז] With ַ, as if from בזז. *Cf.* טח, Is. 44^{18}; Ges. § 72. 7. R. 8. Kö. § 171e rd. יָבֻז; but the pf. is more expressive. *Cf.* Ges. § 106. 6 (a).—וראו] A co-ordinate vb. with the force of an inf. *Cf.* Ges. § 120. 2 (a).—האבן הבדיל] Acc. to We. the object here meant is the same as האבן הראש of v. 7. So Now., Marti. There is less ground for any such opinion if the text be transposed so that v. 7 will follow instead of preceding this one. On the construction of הבדיל, see 2 K. 16^{14}; Ges. § 127. 4 (a) *fin.*—ביד] 𝔖, pl. The oriental reading is לפני.—**6aβ-b.** לאמר] 𝔖 om.—בחיל] 𝔊 adds *μεγάλῃ*.—ברוחי] 𝔖 om. sf.—אמר] Rd. נאם, as in 1^{3}.—**7.** הר] The voc. regularly takes the art. *Cf.* Ges. § 126. 2 (e). Nor need it be omitted on account of a preceding ה. *Cf.* 2 K. 6^{17}. Per-

haps other changes should be made. Lambert (*ZAW.*, 1902, 338) for the first three words rds. ושמתי את ההר; but the present text could be more easily explained as a corruption of כי אתן את ההר. Houb. rds. כי אתה.—The accentuation requires that למישור be treated as a separate clause, הָיָה being understood; and this division is followed by many exegetes. So Bla., Mau., Klie., Ke., Pres., Brd., Or., *et al.* If, however, the present text be retained, the first of four lines should close with הגדול. So 𝔙, followed by Lu., Marck, Pem., Lowth, Ew., Hd., Pu., Wri., We., Now., GASm., *et al.* Either of the emendations suggested would permit a similar arrangement.—הראשה] Om. the final ה, or, with van H., change it to a כ and attach it to the following word. *Cf.* הכהן הראש, 2 Ch. 31^{10}. Houb. rds. לראש.—תשאות] From שוא; without ב an acc. of manner. *Cf.* Ges. § 118. 5 (c). The Vrss. diverge more or less from the thought of 𝔐, but there is no good reason for supposing that they had a different text.—6^{15}. Why the latter half of the verse was inserted at this point, there seems to be no means of determining. Marti thinks it may have a bearing on the promises of chs. 7 *f.* It is more probably a reminder by a pious scribe that such blessings as are promised in the preceding context are conditioned on the faithfulness to Yahweh of those who desire them.

3. A NEW ERA (chs. 7 *f*).

This part of the book consists of the recital of an incident that gave Zechariah an occasion for resuming his prophetical activity, and a series of oracles setting forth what Yahweh requires of his people and what he purposes to do for them in the given circumstances.

a. An inquiry from Bethel (7^{1-3}).

The people of Bethel send to Jerusalem to inquire of the priests and the prophets whether they shall continue to observe the fast of the fifth month.

1. It was in *the fourth year of Darius*, that is, the year 518 B.C. The king had some time previously overthrown his most troublesome enemies and was now engaged in strengthening his hold on his vast empire. Perhaps, as has been suggested, he was in Egypt when the prophecies that follow were written. *Cf.* p. 23. More precisely, it was *the fourth of the ninth month* of the given year, or

more than two years after work was begun on the temple, when the incident to be described took place. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{15}. The ninth month was later called *Kislew* (Ne. 1^{1}), as the reader is informed in a gloss. The clause, *the word of Yahweh came to Zechariah*, by which the month and the day of the month are separated from the year to which they belong, is also an interpolation.—**2.** On the day named a person, or persons, sent one or more others on a certain mission. The verse has been variously translated, but never very satisfactorily. It is doubtful if the present text can be so rendered as to avoid objections. Thus, if Bethel be made the subject,* there is the objection that places were not personified by the Hebrews, except in poetry. If, on the other hand, this word, either as a proper name or an appellative for the temple at Jerusalem, be treated as the destination of the mission,† the criticism is that there was at this time no sanctuary at Bethel, and the one at Jerusalem was called the house, not of God, but of Yahweh. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{2} Zc. 7^{3} 8^{9}. This being the case, the later exegetes have resorted to emendation, but thus far they have not proposed a reading that has found general acceptance. The most promising place to look for help is in $8^{18\,ff.}$, where Zechariah gives his answer to the specific question that had been propounded. Now, it is interesting to note that, in vv. $^{21\,f.}$ of this passage, a clause of the verse under consideration is twice repeated. This repeated clause, however, is not the most important feature of the passage. More significant is the prediction that in the future men will come to Jerusalem to worship the God of the Hebrews by cities and nations; for this indicates that those addressed were representatives of a place, and that therefore the name Bethel is correct and genuine. Moreover, it suggests that the original reading was, *the men of Bethel sent*. The verb does not require that its object be expressed. It is possible, therefore, that the prophet left it indefinite. The Massoretic text gives two names which, if they are genuine, must be interpreted as designating the persons chosen to represent the little city. The first, *Sarezer*, which seems to be an abbreviated form of a Babylonian compound,‡

* So Bla., Klie., Ke., Hd., Pres., Brd., Pu., Or., *et al.*
† So 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, Jer., Lu., AV., Marck, Grot., Seck., Lowth, Rosenm., *et al.*
‡ *Cf.* 2 K. 19^{37} Je. 39^{3}.

would imply that the bearer of it, if a Jew, was born in Babylonia; the second that its owner was of Palestinian birth. *Cf.* 1 Ch. 2^{47}. These two, or others unnamed, were sent, as is taken for granted, to Jerusalem, first of all, according to the Massoretic text, *to entreat Yahweh*, that is, to seek his favour by the presentation of the customary offering. Now, it is altogether probable that the offering was brought. It would please the priests, if it did not affect Yahweh. But the absence of a connective at the beginning of v. ^{3} leaves room for doubt whether the prophet is responsible for this item. Perhaps, however, the missing connective, since the Syriac Version has one, should be supplied.

3. The ultimate object of the mission was *to say to the priests of the house of Yahweh*, the unfinished temple at Jerusalem, *and to the prophets*. Haggai and Zechariah are the only prophets of the time whose names have been preserved, but, according to 8^{9}, there must have been others. These prophets are apparently here placed on an equality with the priests. The passage implies also that the two classes were on as good terms with each other as they were when the Deuteronomic law was promulgated, and that therefore they could unite in a decision. The question to be decided is, *Shall I*—the little city speaks through its envoy or envoys as a unit—*weep in the fifth month, or abstain, as I have done now how many years?* This question was a natural one. The fast of the fifth month commemorated the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple by the Babylonians. *Cf.* 2 K. $25^{8\,ff.}$ Je. $52^{12\,ff.}$.* It had been observed ever since the Jews went into captivity (v. ^{5}), a period of nearly seventy years. Now, however, the captivity was a thing of the past, and, although their city as yet had no wall, it was beginning to grow and the temple was well on the way to completion. These facts called for recognition and gratitude; feelings inconsistent with the continued commemoration of former misfortunes. The people of Bethel appear to have been the first to realise what had taken place. At any rate, they were the first to move in the matter;

* These two passages do not exactly agree on the date of the destruction of the city, the former putting it on the seventh, the latter on the tenth of the month. The Jews explain the discrepancy by saying that the Babylonians entered the temple on the seventh and profaned it until the ninth, when they set it on fire and left it to burn until the tenth. *Cf.* Rodkinson, *Babylonian Talmud; Taanith*, 86.

which was greatly to their credit, for this movement marks the appearance of a new spirit in Judah, a faith in Yahweh and the future which the prophet had long been trying to kindle. The question, therefore, though in form a request for instruction, is really a proposal for the abolition of the now meaningless fast.

1. In 1^7 it was found that, for some reason, the formula, "The word of Yahweh came to Zechariah," etc., had been inserted between the date and the incident to which it belonged. This verse has been expanded in the same way, but not to the same extent; for the pedigree of the prophet has been omitted, also the meaningless inf. לאמר. The clause betrays its origin, however, not only by its position between the items of the date, but by its form, the name of the prophet taking the place of the pron. of the first person. *Cf.* v. ^{4} $8^{1. 18}$.—בכסלו] Sometimes (20 mss.) בכסליו. For the reasons for regarding this word, like the הוא חדש שבט of 1^7, as an interpolation, see the critical note on the latter. In Now.'s translation the latter half of this verse appears in Italics, as if it were of secondary origin; but this is doubtless a printer's error, for the author recognises in his comments the genuineness of the entire date.—**2.** ביתאל] Not בית־אל, as in most mss. and edd. There is no sense or construction in which *the house of God* could be used in this connection. *Cf.* BDB. On van H.'s suggestion, בית ישראל, see $2^2/1^{19}$ 8^{13}. The difficulty of construing the word, even as a proper name, has given rise to an attempt to explain it as the name of a god and, as such, a component of the name of the first of the individuals here mentioned. There was, it seems, a god worshipped in western Asia under a name that the Assyrians wrote *Ba-ai-ti-ili*. *Cf.* Winckler, *AF.*, ii, 10 *ff.* Zimmern (*KAT.*^{3}, 438) identifies him with the divinity whom Philo Byblius calls βαίτυλος, the second son of Οὐρανός and Γῆ. We. takes for granted that, since the name שראצר, Ass. *Šar-uṣur*, lacks a subject such as it has, *e. g.*, in *Nabu-šar-uṣur* and *Nergal-šar-uṣur*, ביתאל must be the missing component; in other words, that the first name was *Baitil-šar-uṣur*. So also Peiser. This conjecture at first sight seems to be supported by the occurrence in a commercial document of the reign of Artaxerxes I of the (Phœnician) name *Bit-ili-nuri* (Hilprecht, *Babylonian Expedition*, ix, 60, 76), and it is adopted by Marti and Kittel. *Cf. DB.* There are, however, weighty objections to it. In the first place, it assumes that the name Sareser is defective; whereas, acc. to Schrader (*KAT.*^{2}, 329 *f.*), names of the class to which this is supposed to belong were sometimes abbreviated by the Assyrians and Babylonians, and acc. to 2 K. 19^{37} = Is. 37^{38}, this one was believed by the Jews to have been in actual use among the Assyrians. Even in Je. $39^{3. 13}$, where *Nergal* precedes, the two are not written as one name like *Nebuzardan* and *Nebushazban*. If, however, secondly, it be granted

that the name is defective, there is still good ground for denying that ביתאל is the missing component; for, although it seems to be true that the people of the West used *Bitili* just as the Babylonians did the names of their gods in the formation of personal names, it has not been shown that they made such hybrid compounds, half Phœnician and half Babylonian as *Bit-ili-šar-uṣur*. If, therefore, the two words are retained, they must, apparently, be treated as separate names. The case is put hypothetically because there is some ground for suspecting the genuineness, not only of שראצר, but of רגם מלך. (1) They have the position of objects, but not the sign (את) of the definite acc. *Cf.* Je. 26[22]. (2) They suit the following no better than the preceding context. (3) They are not necessary to an intelligible rendering for the rest of the clause. There is only one objection to accepting the conclusion to which these indications point, viz., that it seems impossible to account for these names except on the supposition that they are genuine. The key to the difficulty is found in 𝔖, which, for רגם מלך, has ܪܒܡܓܐ = רב מג, the title given to Sareser in Je. 39[3. 13]. This reading suggests that these names arose from a gloss by some one who believed, as did the Jews of the time of Jerome, that the inquiry concerning the fast came from Babylon and was brought by proselytes, the name and title used being borrowed from Je. 39. When this gloss, originally שראצר רב מג המלך, was inserted other changes seem to have been made. The original text was probably וישלח אנשי ביתאל.—רגם] If the original gloss had רב מג (van H., רב) perhaps 𝔊 (B, *Αρβεσεέρ*; A, *Αρβεσεσέρ*), which, acc. to Marti, represents ארבעה עשר (Aram., ארביסר), may have come from the similar title רב סרים.—**3.** ויאמר] Rd., with 𝔖, ולאמר.—לבית] Rd., with Kenn. 150, 155, 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗, בבית.—ואל הנביאים] It is possible that these words are an addition to the text. The prophet did not need any warrant from men for replying to a question addressed to the priests. *Cf.* v. [5].—ויאמר] Om. with 𝔊[L] 𝔖.—האבכה] 𝔊 has *εἰ* (ΑΓ), or *ἦ* (Q.), *εἰσελήλυθεν ὧδε* = הבא כה, an evident, but none the less interesting error. See also *ἐποίησεν* for עשיתי.—הנזר] Acc. to Ges. § 113, an adverbial inf. abs. Similarly Ew. § 280 (a); Kö. § 402 e; but 𝔊[L] 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 all seem to have read האנזר. So Houb.—זה] Adverbial, but not in this case, as Ges. § 136. R. 2 (b) puts it, an enclitic. Translate *now* or *already*. *Cf.* Nrd. § 890. 2.—כמה] With ַ in close connection. *Cf.* Ges. § 102. 2 (d).

b. A series of oracles (7^4–8^{23}).

They are four in number. All of them but the third are introduced by the characteristic formula, "Then came the word of Yahweh of Hosts to me." The general subject is the restoration of Judah to the favour of Yahweh. The first deals with

(1) THE TEACHING OF THE PAST (7^{4-14}).

The prophet holds that fasting is valueless as compared with the social virtues, and that the neglect of these latter was the cause of the banishment of his people from their country.

4. The statement, *Then*, lit., *and, came the word of Yahweh of Hosts to me*, would naturally be interpreted as meaning that this oracle was delivered soon, if not immediately, after the arrival of the deputation from Bethel, that is, on or about the fourth of the ninth month. There are those, however, who hold that the question must have been suggested by the approach of the fast mentioned and laid before the priests and the prophets previous to the date on which it was to be observed, the seventh or the tenth of the fifth month. So Wellhausen, who therefore treats the given date as that, not of the appearance of the deputation, but of Zechariah's reply to their inquiry. To this interpretation there are at least two serious objections: (1) It is forced and unnatural; and (2) it is easier to explain the appearance of the deputation from Bethel four months after the fast than the discussion of their mission by Zechariah that long after it had been accomplished. The prophets were usually the first to express themselves on any matter that interested the community. If further explanation is needed, perhaps it will be found in the supposition (Nowack) that there had arisen at Bethel, on the occasion of its last recurrence, a dispute over the propriety of longer observing a fast commemorating the destruction of the temple, and that, after much discussion, the parties had agreed to submit the question to the authorities at Jerusalem.—**5.** The message received by the prophet is addressed, not to the priests alone, or the inhabitants of Bethel, but to *all the people of the land.* It runs like a passage from one of the older prophets. *When ye have fasted and lamented in the fifth month, and in the seventh month, now seventy years, was it for me, pray, that ye fasted?* The fast of the seventh month, according to tradition, was observed on the second of the month* as a memorial of the bloody day on which

* The tradition is that Gedaliah was murdered on the first of the month, but, as this was a feast-day, the fast was appointed for the second. This tradition, however, is evidently based on the inference that, because in 2 K. 25 and Je. 41 the day of the assassination is not given, חדש is to be rendered "new moon." *Cf.* 1^{1}. The Karaites are said to have celebrated this fast on the twenty-fourth of the month, basing their custom upon Ne. 9^{1}.

Gedaliah, whom Nebuchadrezzar had appointed governor of Judea after the destruction of Jerusalem, was assassinated and the Jews fled to Egypt. *Cf.* 2 K. 25^{25} Je. $41^{1\,ff.}$. This fast, also, seems to have been mentioned here because, having occurred during the progress of the discussion at Bethel, it could not well be overlooked. —Both of these fasts had been observed since the beginning of the Exile, or since Jerusalem was taken in 586, and the date of this oracle is 517 B.C., *now about seventy years.*—This fact, however, did not commend the fasters to the favour of Yahweh, because the abstinence they practised and the lamentations they uttered showed no promise of betterment, being an expression, not of godly sorrow for past offences, but of selfish regret for the loss of their country and their liberty. They pitied themselves, but they had not learned to fear Yahweh.—**6.** This being the case, it did not matter whether they ate or refrained from eating. This verse completes the thought. The prophet, speaking for Yahweh, has just said in substance, "Ye have fasted for yourselves"; he now adds, *and when*, or if and whenever, henceforth, *ye eat and drink*, instead of fasting, *is it not ye that are eating and ye that are drinking?* and he might have added, for it is what he meant, "to fill your own bellies." *Cf.* 1 Cor. 8^{8c}.

7. This, as has already been remarked, is a familiar doctrine. It is not strange, therefore, that Zechariah should cite the older prophets in this connection. *Are not these*, he asks, *the things that Yahweh proclaimed by the former prophets?* The things in question are not, as one might carelessly infer, the things already said, but those he has yet to say. *Cf.* vv. $^{11\,ff.}$. They had been said many times *when Jerusalem was peopled and secure, also its cities round about it.* The period to which the prophet refers is, of course, that before the destruction of Jerusalem and the devastation of the surrounding country by the Babylonians. Indeed, it is probable that he was thinking of conditions some time before that melancholy event, for it was when *the Shephelah*, the hilly region that separates the Judean highlands from the Philistine plain, *and the Negeb*, the rolling country south of Hebron, belonged to Judah and *were inhabited.**—**8.** The message of the former prophets should imme-

* For a graphic description of the Shephelah and its history, see GASm., *HG.*, 201 *ff.*; of the Negeb, 278 *ff.*

diately follow, as, without doubt, it did in the original oracle. Now, however, there intervenes another introductory clause inserted by some one who was misled by the "Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts" of the next verse to suppose that the prophet was still speaking in his own person. This clause betrays its secondary character, not only by the interruption of the prophet's thought, but by the form in which it appears. Zechariah would have said, not *to Zechariah*, but *to me*.—**9**. Nowack and others regard the *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts* with which this verse begins, also, as an addition to the original text, but Wellhausen retains it, and with reason, for the citation from the prophets here, as in 1^4, needs such an introductory formula, as a part of it, to give it the desired solemnity.—The message proper consists of two parts. First, certain duties growing out of social relations are enjoined. The first of these is *true*, equal, *justice*, especially in the conduct of judicial proceedings; the least that could be required of members of the same community, yet a requirement which, to judge from the denunciations of the prophets, was almost always flagrantly disregarded among the Hebrews. The second is *kindness*, the good-will that prompts one to meet one's fellows more than half-way. The third is *compassion*, active sympathy with those in any species of misfortune.—**10**. These positive injunctions are followed by a pair of admonitions. The first is equivalent to a repetition of the injunction concerning compassion, with an application of it to different classes of unfortunates. *Oppress not a widow, or an orphan, or a stranger, or a sufferer*, the last term including the poor, the sick, etc. The second is more general, but at the same time more radical, *nor devise evil one toward another in your hearts*. It is a negative putting of the Golden Rule, the observance of which is the sum and substance of social morality. *Cf.* 8^{17}. This, according to Zechariah, was the teaching of the former prophets. He does not pretend to say that all or any of them expressed themselves in the precise language that he employs, but that this was the gist of their instruction on the subject with which he is now dealing. He could easily have substantiated such a statement; for there is hardly one of the prophets before the Exile who does not condemn the tendency to ritualism among his people and insist on the practice of the social virtues.* The same posi-

* *Cf.* Am. $2^{6\,ff.}$ $5^{21\,ff.}$ Ho. $6^{4\,ff.}$ Is. $1^{10\,ff.}$ Mi. $2^{1\,ff.}$ $6^{6\,ff.}$ Je. $7^{1\,ff.}$ Ez. $18^{5\,ff.}$.

tion is taken by the author of Is. 58^{1-12}—vv. $^{13\,f.}$ teach a different doctrine,—who, like Zechariah, gives especial attention to fasting as a religious exercise.

11. The prophet, having indicated what his predecessors taught, proceeds to describe the way in which their instruction was received. This he does in a succession of figures which produce a climax. In the first place, he says the people *refused to listen*, took an entirely negative attitude. *Cf.* 1^4. This is the first stage in the development of obstinacy.* They next *stubbornly turned their backs*, showed positive disrespect to the messengers of Yahweh.† Thirdly, they stopped, lit., *dulled their ears, so as not to hear*, rendered futile the best efforts of the prophets to instruct them.‡—**12.** These manifestations, at first the occasional and temporary ebullitions of an unstable temper, finally became the uniform expression of an utterly rebellious character, the people having, in the words of the prophet, *made their hearts as adamant*.§ It was their deliberate and unchangeable purpose *not to hear the instruction that Yahweh of Hosts had sent them*. The text unnecessarily identifies this instruction with *the words* of v. ^{7}, saying that these words were sent *through his* (Yahweh's) *Spirit*. No doubt Zechariah believed that his predecessors were divinely inspired; but since, like Haggai (2^5), he elsewhere (4^6 6^8) seems to refer to the Spirit of Yahweh as if he were thinking of Yahweh himself, and, except in the visions, represents Yahweh as communicating immediately with his messengers (1^6 6^9, etc.), one is warranted in suspecting the genuineness of this phrase also, and reading, as in v. ^{7}, simply *by*, lit., *by the hand of, the former prophets*.—When it became evident that his people were only confirmed in their evil ways by his efforts through these successive messengers to save them, his patience, to speak after the manner of men, became exhausted, *and there was great wrath from Yahweh of Hosts*.—**13.** The result was disastrous to the objects of this wrath. *It came to pass that*, because, *when he* (Yahweh) *called*, *they* (the fathers) *did not hear*,—There follows as an apodosis in the Massoretic text, *so shall they call, and I will not hear, said Yahweh*, but there are several reasons for regarding these words as a gloss, two or three of which may be given

* *Cf.* Je. 5^3 8^6 $9^{5/6}$ 11^{10}. † *Cf.* Ho. 4^{16} Je. 5^{23} 6^{28}. ‡ *Cf.* Is. 6^{10} Je. 5^{21}.
§ *Cf.* Ex. 8^{15} Ps. $95^{7\,f.}$; also of the neck, 2 K. 17^{14} Je. 19^{15} Ne. 9^{16-29}.

in this connection. (1) They obstruct the natural course of thought without adding anything essential to the passage; (2) they are by Yahweh, and not about him; and (3) they can easily be explained as a reminiscence of Pr. $1^{24\,ff.}$. *Cf.* especially v. ^{28}. For further details, see the critical notes.—**14.** The original apodosis is found in this verse. It reads, not "I," like the preceding,—for the subject should be the same as that of the verb *call*,—but *he*, *scattered them to all the nations*, the many nations, *that they had not known*, in the foreign countries to which they were deported by the Babylonians. On the phraseology, see Dt. 28^{36} Je. 16^{13}, etc. *Thus the land became so desolate behind them*, after their removal, *that none went to and fro, and they made a pleasant land a waste.* *Cf.* Ju. 5^{6} Je. 12^{10} Ez. 35^{7}. The prophet probably did not expect to be taken literally;—there must have been a few who remained in the country;—but it is clear from Je. 40 *ff.* that it was pretty nearly stripped of its inhabitants.

4. צבאות] 𝔖 𝔗 om., as in 4^{8} 6^{9}; but see $8^{1.\,18}$.—**5.** וספור] The inf. abs. for the impf. with ו. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{113.\,4\,(a)}$.—וזה] Rd., with 9 Kenn. mss., 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, זה. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—צמתני] For צמתוני, the reading in 25 Kenn. mss. One of three cases of the use of a sf. with pf. 2 pl. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{59.\,1\,(d)}$. On the construction, see Ges. $§^{117.\,4.\,R.\,3}$.—אני] An emphatic addition to the sf. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{135.\,2\,(a)}$.—**6.** האכלים] When the relation of a nominal predicate to the subject is that of the general to the particular, it wants the article; but when, as in this case, the two are of equal connotation, the predicate may take an art. or a sf. to mark its definiteness. *Cf.* v. ^{7} as emended; Ges. $§^{126.\,2\,(d)\,R.}$; Dr. $§^{135\,(7)}$.—**7.** את] This word has been treated as a sign of the emphatic nominative. So de D., Dru., New., Rosenm., Lowe, *et al.* The passages cited to support this opinion, however, are mostly of doubtful application. Those in this and the preceding book, Hg. $2^{5.\,17}$ Zc. 8^{17}, can all be explained in other ways. Nor is it necessary in this case to supply a vb. such as ירע, עשׂה or שׁמע, as many have done. So Marck, Pem., Mau., Hi., Ew., Köh., Ke., Pres., Pu., Brd., Wri., *et al.* It is better, with 𝔊 𝔖, to rd. אלה. So Seck., We., Now., Marti, Kit. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{117.\,1.\,R.\,7}$.—ישׁב] For ישׁבים, the regular construction. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{145.\,2}$; Kö. $§^{349\,e}$.—**8.** This verse is omitted also by Oort, Or., We., Now., Marti, Rothstein (*Jojachin*, 38). Note that צבאות is omitted, as in v. ^{1}. *Cf.* $8^{1.\,18}$.—**9.** On the genuineness of כה—צבאות, see the comments.—לאמר] Om., with Kenn. 4, 201, $𝔊^{NAB}$ 𝔖, here as in 6^{12}, the only other place where it appears in Zechariah after כה אמר.—שׁפטו, ושׁעקו] Pausal forms. *Cf.* Ges. $§^{29.\,4\,(b)}$.—רחמים]

On the pl., see Ges. § 124. 1. R. (b).—10. נר] Rd., with 22 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, ונר.—איש אחיו] This idiom has already occurred twice (v. ^{9} 3^{10}), but both times in so simple a form that it did not require explanation. In both cases איש was used distributively in apposition with the subject of the clause in which it stood; the most frequent construction. There are cases in which its relation to the context is difficult to determine. One of the most difficult is in Gn. 15^{10}, which Bu. (*Urgeschichte*, 285), translates, "He laid each (animal), its one part over against the other." The construction is probably to be regarded as elliptical. Supply the pl. suf. after יתן, and the result is, "He placed (them) each with one part over against the other," איש being an appositive of the object of the vb., as in 8^{10}. The peculiar construction found here occurs only once elsewhere, viz., Gn. 9^{5}, where מיד איש אחיו is generally rendered, as in AV., "at the hand of every man's brother." So De., Di., Wri., Dr., *et al.* Bu. objects to this rendering because, he says, it means only that all men are brothers. He insists on the reciprocal significance of the idiom, explaining it as only a later and more compact form of איש מיד אחיו. He therefore translates the whole clause, "From every beast will I demand it (your blood), and from men, from one another (from men reciprocally) will I demand the soul of men." *Cf. Urgeschichte*, 288. Similarly Gunkel, Holzinger. This translation, in spite of the parenthetical paraphrases, is not entirely clear. The phrase "from men reciprocally" is especially perplexing. It cannot, of course, mean that the reciprocity is to be between God and men. If, however, it is to be among men, the only idea suggested is that men are to require of one another the blood of a slain fellow, the parties being the avenger and the murderer. Now, this may have been the thought of the Heb. author, but, if it was, he contradicted himself in the effort to express it; for, if מיד איש אחיו = איש מיד אחיו, Yahweh says in the main clause that he will make requirement for blood, but in the phrase in question that men will do so. In other words the distributive איש is treated as if the vb. were not אדרש, *I will demand*, but ידרשו, *they* (men) *will demand*. The contradiction can be remedied, on the supposition that the above equation is correct, by removing the phrase to the end of the clause, or treating it as a marginal gloss to the whole of it. Then איש will be an appositive of האדם^{2}, and, like it, in the gen.; and the whole will read, "From the hands of men will I demand the lives of men (one's life from the hand of another)." The object of the glossator was to call attention to the fact that, while in the first instance the slayer and the slain are widely unlike, in the second they belong to the same species. The construction of איש is that in which it is found, without אחיו, in Gn. 42^{25}, which should be rendered, not as it is by Bu. (*l. c.*, 285), "to return their money to each one into his sack," but, "to return their money, each one's (money) to his sack." The object of this discussion was to determine whether מיד איש אחיו could be treated as the

equivalent of איש מיד אחיו. If, as has been shown, it can, in the proper position, there is reason for supposing that Zechariah, although in 8^{17} he uses איש את רעת רעהו, here preferred the more concise רעת איש אחיו. There can be no question but that the meaning is the same in both cases. The difference between the two is no greater or more significant than that between "evil one against another" and "evil against one another." Nor can one find any fault with the construction, since, if the regular form were substituted for the one actually used, איש could be construed, as it frequently is, as an appositive of the subject of the clause. *Cf* Ges. § 139. 1 (a). 𝔖 has the equivalent of, רעת איש על אחיו, but 𝔊's rendering favours 𝔐. See also 𝔗.

11. כתף] Rd., with $𝔊^{L}$ 𝔖 𝔗, כתפם.—משמוע] *So as not.* *Cf.* Ges. § 119. 3. (d) (1).—**12.** שמיר] A second acc. *Cf.* Ges. § 117. 5 (c).—התורה] 𝔊, τοῦ νόμου μου, a case of dittog. in the translation. *Cf.* πνεύματα αὐτοῦ. —ואת הדברים] The object of this gloss evidently was to prevent the reader from interpreting התורה in the sense of *instruction*, and require him to distinguish between "the Law" and "the Prophets"; which, of course, is contrary to the teaching of Zechariah.—ברוחו] This expression, too, must be considered a gloss because it, like the similar additions of 𝔗, removes Yahweh further from his people than Zechariah represents him.—**13.** ויהי] The Gk. and Syr. translators were misled by the gloss at the end of the verse, the former into rendering this vb. by the fut., and the latter into translating קרא as if it were in the 1 sg. See also the Eng. Vrss. It is evident, however, that the prophet is here giving the result of the obduracy of his people. Now, that result, as appears from v. [14], when the prophet wrote, was a matter of history. Hence ויהי must have its usual meaning, while the vbs. that follow should also refer to the past. Those of the latter part of the verse cannot be so rendered. *Contra* New. This fact in itself is sufficient to confirm the opinion already expressed in the comments, to the effect that the passage to which they belong is an interpolation. See also אמר for נאם, which, as has elsewhere been noted (1^{3} 4^{6}), is an indication of ungenuineness.—קרא] 𝔖 adds a pronominal object to this vb., and $𝔊^{NAQΓL}$ do the same for ישמע, but such additions are not required by the Heb. idiom. *Cf.* Pr. 1^{24} On the vocalisation of the latter vb., see Ges. § 29. 4 (b).—**14.** ואסערם] Since the next vb. is a pf., the ו of this one should be pointed as ו cons., and since in the protasis the speaker was the prophet, the original here must have been ויסערם. The person was changed to bring this vb. into harmony with אשמע of the interpolated passage preceding. There is, therefore, no necessity for discussing the peculiar vocalisation of 𝔐. *Cf.* Ges. §§ 23. 3. R. 2; 52. 2 (c) R. 2.—על] Rd., with 𝔊 (εἰς), אל.—ידעום] Bu. justly claims that the main dichotomy of the verse should be at this point.—מעבר] On מן privative, see Ges. § 119. 3 (d) (1).—לשמה] On the use of ל instead of the acc., see Ges. § 119. 3 (c) (2).

(2) THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE (8^{1-8}).

The prophet announces that Yahweh will presently return to Jerusalem to bless it with wonderful prosperity, and that thenceforth there will be an unbroken covenant between him and its inhabitants. The paragraph consists of five declarations, each of which is introduced by a *Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts*.

1 *f.* The usual introductory formula is followed by a very emphatic assertion of the divine jealousy. In $1^{14\text{ f.}}$ this sentiment was found to have a twofold reference, manifesting itself in sympathy or compassion on the one side, and in anger or vengeance on the other. Here, also, both sides appear, but they are not so clearly distinguished. First Yahweh says, *I have been very jealous for Sion;* by which he means that he has been anxious and eager to help it because it is the home of his chosen people. At the same time his indignation has been stirred against the unnamed oppressors who have devastated it. *Very furious*, he declares, *has been my jealousy concerning it.* *Cf.* 1^{15}.—**3.** From this point onward Yahweh, forgetting his indignation, reveals only the tender side of his jealousy. He begins by saying that he will now, after an absence of seventy years, *return to Sion*, and the form of the verb indicates that he intends to do so speedily, that, in fact, his return is as good as accomplished. Moreover, this is to be a final reunion between him and his people, for he is careful to say that he will *abide*, make his permanent home, *in Jerusalem*. The latter half of the verse describes in the briefest terms the character and condition of the Jerusalem of the future. First, says Yahweh, it shall be called *the faithful city*. Isaiah (1^{21}) described the faithful city as "full of justice, where righteousness dwelt." Zechariah, to judge from the preceding chapter, doubtless had the same idea. Neither of them, however, considered this a complete definition. The latter would have included all the virtues the lack of which had brought the wrath of Yahweh upon the fathers. In vv. $^{16\text{ f. }19}$ he specifies truthfulness and peacefulness as additional requirements. It is safe, therefore, to infer that, when he put this name into the mouth of Yahweh, he was giving expression to his faith that the time was

coming when the people of Jerusalem and Judah would not only worship Yahweh alone, but loyally observe all the precepts he had given them for the regulation of their conduct toward one another. There follows another name the application of which is easily misunderstood. The sentence in which it occurs, so far as its structure is concerned, is evidently parallel with the one just discussed. If, therefore, it were complete, it would read, *the mountain of Yahweh of Hosts* shall be called *the holy mountain.* It is not so clear what is meant by the mountain of Yahweh. At first sight one might take it as meaning the hill on which the new temple was being erected; but there is not so much to be said for this interpretation as might be expected. The name given to the mountain cannot be cited in its favour. By "the holy mountain," or its equivalent, is generally meant, not Mount Moriah,* as it is sometimes called, but either Jerusalem, as a hilly city (Is. 27^{13} 66^{20}, etc.) or the whole hilly region of Judea. *Cf.* Is. 11^{9} Je. 37^{13}, etc. It is therefore necessary to take it in one of these senses in this connection, and, in view of the fondness of the Hebrews for parallelism, it is more than probable that the former is the one in which the prophet intended that it should be taken. His idea, then, is that, when the temple has been completed and Yahweh has returned to it, the whole city will be sanctified and preserved inviolate by his presence. Thus the two names are only another way of putting the familiar promise of v. [8], "they shall be my people, and I will be their God."

4. The presence of Yahweh will secure to his people peace and prosperity. One result of such conditions will be that *there shall again*, as in the best period of their history, *sit in the streets of Jerusalem*, enjoying the ease as well as the respect to which they are entitled, *old men and women, each with his* (or her) *staff in his* (or her) *hand*, a sign and symbol of that best of Yahweh's blessings, from the Hebrew's stand-point, *multitude of days. Cf.* Ex. 20^{12} Dt. 4^{40} Is. 65^{20} Pr. 3^{2}, etc. The picture is true to the habits of the inhabitants of Palestine, both ancient and modern. *Cf.* 1 Mac. 14^{9}. Their houses are, and always have been, so dark that they have been accustomed to do their work and seek their pleasure in

* So Jer., Dru., Rosenm., Ke., Brd., Wri., *et al.*

the open air.—**5.** The prophet completes the peaceful picture by describing the city as *full of boys and girls playing in the streets.* It is clear that he is here predicting an era of large families. This, however, is not the whole thought. There will not only be many children, but conditions will be such that they will be able to spend their early years in ideal freedom from untimely burdens. Meanwhile, according to 3^{10}, those of middle age will divide their time between labour and the enjoyment of the fruits of their exertions. —**6.** It was difficult for the people of Zechariah's time, pinched as they were by poverty, and harassed by their neighbours, to believe that such blessings were in store for them and their country. Yahweh rebukes them for their lack of faith. *If it is difficult*, lit., *wonderful*, *in the eyes of the remnant of this people*, he says, *in my eyes also it will be difficult!?* The last clause is usually treated as a simple question, but in the original the construction indicates that the prophet intended to give it an ironical turn. See further the critical notes.—**7.** In his final declaration Yahweh more fully reveals his plan for increasing the population of Judea. He will not only bless those already there with sons and daughters, but he will reinforce them from the regions to which he scattered their fathers. *I will save my people*, he says, *from the country of the rising, and from the country of the setting sun.* The eastern country, of course, is Babylonia. The western is probably Egypt. *Cf.* Is. 11^{11} * 27^{13}, etc.—**8.** From both he will bring back the exiled Jews and *they shall abide*, dwell without further disturbance, and he with them, *in Jerusalem* and the surrounding country.† A guarantee for the permanence of the new order is found in the renewed covenant to which reference has already been made. *They shall be to me a people*, says Yahweh, *and I will be to them a God*, *in faithfulness and righteousness.*‡ Note that the terms are the same for both parties. They are both bound to remain steadfast to the relation now established forever, and, that it may never be severed, to observe without ceasing all the requirements that this relation implies. This, whether in God or man, is Righteousness.

* In this passage only the first two names belong to the original prophecy. In both Assyria must be interpreted as meaning Babylonia, the then world power.

† *Cf.* Ho. 2^{23}. Ez. 11^{20} 36^{28}.

‡ *Cf.* $2^{14/10}$ 8^{3} Ex. 29^{45}.

1. צבאות] Add, with 42 mss., 𝔖 𝔗, אלי, as in all the other instances of the use of this formula.—2. צבאות] Omitted, but wrongly, by 𝔖. *Cf.* vv. $^{4.\ 6.\ 7.\ 9}$.—קנאתי] 𝔊 adds *τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ καὶ* from 1^{14}.—וחמה] A word of kindred meaning substituted for the proper internal object. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{117.\ 2.\ R.\ (a)}$.—3. יהוה] Add, with 8 Kenn. mss., 𝔊$^{Comp.}$ 𝔙, צבאות, as in all similar cases in this chapter.—4. ואיש] The ו, which is unnecessary, is omitted by Kenn. 150, 𝔊. In 𝔖 it is retained and a vb. very properly inserted in the clause which follows.—5. ימלאו] Masc. after a fem. subj. *Cf.* Ges. § $^{145.\ 7\ (b)\ R.\ 2}$. On the gender of the subj., *cf.* BDB.—משחקים] Masc. with nouns of both genders. *Cf* Ges. § $^{122.\ 1.\ R.\ 2}$. —6. כי] A conditional particle, comparatively frequent in legal passages. According to BDB. it usually represents the case supposed as more likely to occur than אם. *Cf.* Ex. $21^{2.\ 7.\ 18}$, etc.—בימים ההם] These words can only be rendered *in those days;* but, so rendered, they have no meaning in their present setting. They must therefore be regarded as a gloss, perhaps, to the next clause.—גם] Ew. § $^{324\ a}$ and Ges. § $^{150.\ 1}$ explain the omission of the interrogative particle in this case as due to the emphatic arrangement of the sentence. This, however, is a mistake, since it can be shown that the ratio of cases in which the arrangement is irregular, among sentences usually classed as questions, is as great for those that have the particle as for those from which it is omitted. The truth is that, when the particle is intentionally omitted, the clause which it would introduce is generally not a simple question, but contains an element of incredulity, irony, sarcasm or repugnance which it would not so much denote as conceal. *Cf.* 1 S. $21^{16/15}$ 22^{7} Hb. 2^{19} Jb. 2^{10} 11^{2} 37^{18} 38^{18} $40^{30}/41^{6}$ La. 3^{36}. There are many passages equally ironical, however, especially in the book of Job, in which the particle is employed. *Cf.* Nrd. § $^{1098.\ 4.\ b}$; also *Old Testament and Semitic Studies*, ii, 115 *ff.*—7. מזרח—מבוא השמש] We. would read מזרח השמש—מבוא. *Cf.* Mal. 1^{11} Ps. 50^{1} 113^{3}. This, no doubt, would be more elegant, but, since מזרח is often used alone in the sense of *the east*, the present reading is perfectly defensible. *Cf.* Am. 8^{12} etc.—8. אתם] 𝔊^{L} adds *εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτῶν*.—ושכנו]. 𝔊, *κατασκηνώσω*, as in v. ^{3}; but Comp. *κατασκηνώσουσιν*.

(3) THE PAST AND FUTURE IN CONTRAST (8^{9-17}).

The prophet recalls the want and suffering through which his people have passed, assuring them that henceforth Yahweh will bless them with abundance and happiness, yet only on condition that they contribute to this end, not by observing fasts and other formalities, but by obeying faithfully the demands of righteousness.

9. The section begins with an exhortation, *Let your hands be strong*. It reminds one of Hg. 2^4 and the work on which the Jews, under the leadership of Zerubbabel, were then, and had for many months been, engaged, the erection of the second temple. Zechariah, too, had this in mind; for those for whom the exhortation is intended are addressed as *ye that hear in these days these words*, the words above written, *from the mouths of the prophets that were*, and prophesied, *at the time when the foundation of the house of Yahweh of Hosts was laid*. This is an unmistakable reference to Haggai and his unknown associates and the glowing predictions by which they sought to encourage the people, first to undertake, and then to continue, their sacred task. *Cf.* Hg. $2^{6\,ff.}$. These inspiring utterances Zechariah claims merely to be repeating.—**10.** There follows a more detailed presentation of the reason why the work in hand should be courageously and vigorously prosecuted. It is found in the contrast between the conditions preceding the commencement of these operations and those that are now promised, *Before those days*, in those former days, before the foundation of the temple, *hire for men was not paid*, lit., *did not become, and hire for cattle there was none*, because, as Haggai puts it, Yahweh had commanded a drought that fell like a blight "upon men and cattle, and upon all the labour of their hands." *Cf.* also Hg. $2^{16\,f.}$. There were other troubles to which Haggai does not refer. The little community then, as in the later days of Nehemiah (Ne. $4^{1/7}$), was almost constantly harassed by gentile neighbours; *nor was there peace for one that went or came, on account of the adversary*. Moreover, there was so frequent and general strife among the Jews themselves that it seemed as if Yahweh by an evil spirit had *moved*, lit., *sent, all men one against another*. Thus they were rendered less capable of enduring the other ills by which they were afflicted.

11. It was Yahweh who sent all these misfortunes. He was angry with his people, and this was his way of showing his displeasure. *But now* that a new temple is rising on the site of the old one, the prime cause of his anger has been removed. He says, therefore, *I am not as in former days*, before the new structure was begun, *toward the remnant of this people*, the little colony in and about Jerusalem. Here, again, Zechariah follows Haggai, who,

it will be remembered, predicted (2^{15}) that a new era of prosperity would begin with the foundation of the house of Yahweh.—**12.** There is further evidence of the dependence of Zechariah on his predecessor in the language in which Yahweh now describes the effect of the change in his attitude toward his people. Thus, the promise of Yahweh that he *will sow peace*, or *prosperity*, if this is the original reading, has its parallel in Hg. 2^{9}, where Yahweh says, "In this place (Jerusalem) I will grant prosperity. *Cf.* Mal. $3^{20}/4^{2}$. The details that follow also remind one of Haggai. Perhaps the first clause, *the vine shall yield its fruit*, was not suggested by the earlier prophet, but the next two are an adaptation of Hg. 1^{10}. The future, according to Zechariah, is to differ from the recent past in that *the earth shall yield*, not withhold, *its produce*, because *heaven*, instead of refusing, *shall grant its dew*. These are great blessings, but the best of all is that they are to be permanent. *I will cause the remnant of this people*, says Yahweh, *to inherit*, as a lasting possession, *all these things*.—**13.** Finally, Zechariah expands the brief sentence with which Haggai closes the parallel passage (2^{19}) with an antithetical statement in which he again sets the past and the present over against each other. In the first place Yahweh reminds his people of their late unfortunate condition. *Ye were a curse among the nations*. This does not mean that they were a source or occasion of misfortune to their neighbours, but that the other nations, seeing their unfortunate condition, recognised in it the hand of Yahweh, and, as they would have cast a stone at the grave of a malefactor, added to the divine penalty their reproaches and execrations.* The other member of the antithesis must be similarly interpreted. This is clear from the clause, *I will help you*, by which it is introduced. The fact that the Jews are to be the object of Yahweh's help makes it necessary, when he adds, *and ye shall be a blessing*, to understand this as meaning that they will henceforth be blessed by him, and universally recognised as the special objects of the divine favour, so that when men wish for themselves or others, they will be able to conceive of no greater felicity than that which the Chosen People enjoy.† For a similar antithesis, see Dt. 28^{63} Je. $31^{27 f.}$. The prospect of so complete a

* *Cf.* Dt. 21^{23} Je. 25^{18} 26^{6}, etc.

† *Cf.* Gn. $12^{2 f.}$ Ps. 72^{17}.

change in their fortunes is good ground for encouragement. Hence Yahweh repeats the exhortation with which the paragraph began, *Fear not; let your hands be strong.*

14. In this verse and the next Yahweh repeats the assurance just given, employing the same means as before, antithesis, to give it emphasis. In the first place he recalls the past, including the dark gap in the history of Judah. *I purposed to do you*, as a people, *evil*, he says, referring to the threats of which the messages of the earlier prophets largely consisted, *when*, and because, *your fathers provoked me*, by neglecting the instruction they had received. The provocation was so serious and persistent that, although, even at the last moment, he would gladly have spared them, he *did not repent*, but gave them into the hands of their enemies.—**15.** This purpose having been fulfilled, Yahweh has conceived a new purpose, suggested by love rather than anger and fraught with salvation instead of destruction. *So*, he declares, *have I again in these days purposed to do good to Jerusalem and the house of Judah.* To make the parallel between these two verses and the one preceding more complete, he adds the reassuring words, *fear not.*—**16.** At first sight vv. $^{16\ f.}$ seem a useless repetition. They are, indeed, a repetition, but by no means one devoid of significance. The prophet wished to add an important modification to the thought of vv. $^{11-13}$, but, if he had attached it immediately to v. ^{13}, the effect would have been to weaken the impression already made without obtaining for the new thought the attention it deserved. It was better, therefore, to take a fresh start and make the added thought the principal one in a new connection, repeating the one to be qualified by way of introduction. This latter is the restoration of Yahweh's favour. His people, however, must not be allowed to suppose that his new purpose is arbitrary, and its fulfilment unconditioned; or that the only condition is the maintenance of the temple and its worship. To prevent any such mistake he again reminds them, as in $7^{9\ f.}$, that they have duties to one another which they may not leave undone. *These*, he says, *are the things that ye shall do;* and he proceeds to enumerate them. The first of these requirements, that they *speak the truth one to another*, is not mentioned in $7^{9\ f.}$, but the second, *deal peaceful justice in your gates*, is found

there in a slightly different form. By peaceful justice is doubtless meant a justice so impartial that none can quarrel with it. See the "peaceful counsel" of 6^{13}. The reference to the gates recalls the fact that in an oriental town the gate, or the open space near it, has always been the place where men were most accustomed to gather, and therefore where justice, or a pretence of it, was administered. *Cf.* Gn. 19^{1} Am. $5^{10.12}$, etc.—**17.** The prophet could hardly have omitted the broad principle enunciated in 7^{10}. He therefore again adjures his people, *Do not devise evil one against another in your hearts.* Finally, he adds a new precept, which, however, is familiar enough to the reader of the Old Testament, being embodied in the third of the Ten Commandments, *nor love a false oath.** The final clause, if interpreted strictly, would refer only to the last two items in the preceding enumeration; for, of course, Zechariah did not intend to say that Yahweh hated truth and justice. It is probable, however, that the prophet, when he added this statement, was thinking, not of these virtues, but the neglect of them; otherwise he would hardly have used the word *all* of the things hated. Three of the things here mentioned are among the seven "abominations" enumerated in Pr. $6^{16\,ff.}$; but there does not seem to be any connection between the two passages. The prophet certainly did not borrow from the sage.

9. אשר—להבנות] The whole clause is rejected as an addition to the original by Marti; but there are good reasons for retaining all but the last two words. (1) It seems necessary to make the reference to *the prophets* easily intelligible; and (2) it is required by הימים ההם of v. [10], which would be meaningless without it. There is room for doubt, however, about ביום, for which 𝔊 𝔖 seem to have had מיום, a reading which some critics have adopted. So Ew., Hi., Now., Marti. On the other hand, 𝔐 is supported by the fact that the words in question are evidently those spoken by Haggai and others at or about the time when the movement to rebuild the temple was started. *Cf.* Hg. $1^{6\,ff.}$ $2^{15\,ff.}$. The last two words, ההיכל להבנות, seem to have been added by some one who, following the Chronicler, wished to remind the reader that this was the second attempt of the kind.—**10.** הימים ההם] Marti would read הימים האלה; but he is forced to emend by his rejection of the latter part of v. [9]. If the alleged gloss be retained, it will appear that the prophet distinguished three points or periods of time, *these days, the time when the foundation,*

* *Cf.* Dt. 5^{4} Ex. 23^{7} Dt. $19^{16\,ff.}$, etc.

etc., and here the period *before those days*, *i. e.*, before the temple was begun.—נהיה] 𝔊 has the future here and throughout the verse, except in some curs. mostly of L.—וָאשׁלּח] Dr. (§ 66. note 2) classes this among the exceptions to the rule that ו cons. takes ָ before the 1 sg. impf.; but it may be simply a mistake for וָאשׁלּח, or, as Da. § 51. R. 6 suggests, the vb. may be a frequentative. The former alternative is favoured by Now., Marti, Kit.—**11.** כימים] For כ׳+ב. *Cf.* Ges. § 118. 6 (*b*).—אֲני] Some mss. have the pausal form אָני.—**12.** זרע השׁלום] These words can only be rendered, as in 𝔙, *the seed of peace* or *prosperity*. The phrase has sometimes been connected with the following context, גפן being construed as an appositive of זרע. So Ew., Hi., Ke., Köh., Wri., *et al.* There seems to be no reason, however, why the vine should be so distinguished. Hence, others have preferred to emend by reading זרעה שׁלום, *its seed*, or, more exactly, the increase of *its seed*, *shall be sure*, prosperous. So Klo., Now. To this suggestion there is the objection that it is not sufficiently evident to what the sf. of the subj. refers, and when one is informed that the antecedent is שׁארית of v. 11, the combination thus produced is confusing. It is much better, with We., to change זרע to אזרעה, thus getting the intelligible thought, *I will sow prosperity*. *Cf.* Ho. 2^{23/21} Je. 31^{27 f.}. So also Marti, GASm., Kit.—**13.** וישׂראל] This name has occurred once before in these prophecies, viz., in 2²/1¹⁹. It was found, however, by a comparison of that verse with 2⁴/1²¹ that it (the name) was an interpolation. The same is the case here. In the next four verses the persons addressed are the same as in this passage. But in v. 15, where the prophet has occasion to give them a name, he calls them simply "the house of Judah." In other words, Zechariah did not predict the return of Israel, but some one familiar with such passages as Je. 23^{5 ff.} Ez. 37^{15 ff.}, missing any reference to the northern kingdom, supplied the name here without noticing that from his stand-point v. 15 also needed emendation. Both names are omitted by We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**14.** אמר] A third case of this use of the word where one would expect נאם, and in a passage that only disturbs the connection. *Cf* 1³ 7¹³.—ולא] The negative is omitted by 𝔖 in Par. and Lond.—**15.** וזמתי] 𝔊 𝔖 have a connective, but the fact that both have the pf. shows that it was wanting in the original. On this construction, see Ges. § 120. 2 (*b*).—**16.** את רעהו] Seven mss. have אל רעהו. So also 𝔊.—ואמת] A gloss to שׁלום suggested by 7⁹. Om. 𝔊^{AQL} 𝔊^H 𝔗 𝔖^H. So New., Now., Marti, Kit.—שׁלום. Two mss. prefix ו. So also 𝔖. It is possible that the original was שָׁלֵם, which would practically be a synonym of אמת. *Cf.* 7⁹ Dt. 25¹⁵ Ru. 2¹².—**17.** איש וג׳] See note on 7¹⁰.—אשׁר] Om., with 5 mss., 𝔊 𝔖. So Bla., We., Now., Marti, Kit. This method of disposing of the word relieves one from the necessity of attributing to את² entirely unwarranted meanings or functions. *Cf.* Ges. § 117. 1. R. 7; Da. § 72. R. 4. The insertion of the relative was probably due to oversight of the sign of the acc.—יהוה]

𝔊 𝔖 add נבאות, whether correctly or incorrectly, it is impossible to decide, since Zechariah writes יהוה alone, even at the end of the verse. *Cf.* 1^4 $2^{10.\ 14}$.

(4) THE REIGN OF JOY AND GLADNESS (8^{18-23}).

The fasts will all be transformed into seasons of rejoicing, and the nations, seeing the blissful change in the condition of the Jews, will come to worship their God, that they may share his favour.

18. The introductory statement is regular, as in the case of the first two oracles.—**19.** The people of Bethel, in their message to the priests and the prophets, mentioned only one fast, that of the fifth month. *Cf.* 7^3. Zechariah in 7^5 refers to another, that of the seventh month. It now appears that there were no fewer than four, the first of which fell in *the fourth month*, Tammuz. It also commemorated an incident in the final struggle at Jerusalem, for it was on the ninth day of the fourth month, that is, toward the end of June, when the breach was made in the wall and the Babylonians entered the city.* On the origin of the fasts of *the fifth* and *seventh* months, see $7^{3.\ 5}$. That of *the tenth*, Tebeth, was instituted as a reminder of the date, the tenth of that month, that is, toward the end of December, on which the forces of Nebuchadrezzar arrived at Jerusalem and began the siege of the city.† These days may still be celebrated, but not, as heretofore, with fasting and mourning. They are to be transformed into occasions for *joy and gladness, even cheerful festivals*.‡ This picture was calculated to make those for whom the message was intended forget the past with all its suffering. The prophet evidently feared that it might make them forget their responsibilities. That they may not he adds an exhortation, obedience to which will insure the fulfilment of their most sanguine expectations, *But love truth and peace.* The latter, of course, includes the things that make for peace. *Cf.* v. ^{16}.—**20.** The prophet has already ($2^{15/11}$) intimated that the time would come when other nations would participate in the blessings promised to the Chosen People. He now resumes this thought for the purpose of making it the climax of his presentation of the divine

* *Cf.* 2 K. $25^{3\,f.}$ Je. $39^{2\,f.}$.

† *Cf.* 2 K. 25^1 Je. 39^1.

‡ *Cf.* Am. 8^{10} Je. $31^{13/12}$.

program. Speaking for Yahweh, he says, *There shall yet come peoples*, peoples now hostile or indifferent to the Jews, *even the inhabitants of many cities*, the cities of the just mentioned peoples. *Cf.* Is. 2[3] Mi. 4[2].—**21.** There will be so general eagerness among these peoples that *the inhabitants of one* city *shall go to another, saying, Let us by all means go to entreat Yahweh.* The final words are not a continuation of the same speech, but apparently the reply of the one addressed, *I also will go.*

22. The result of this universal interest will be that *many peoples and mighty nations shall come to seek Yahweh of Hosts in Jerusalem, and to entreat Yahweh.* The means by which they will seek to appease him and secure his favour is no doubt the presentation of sacrifices in the new temple; which, indeed, they are to assist in building.—**23.** Zechariah concludes with a picture that seems to have been suggested by Is. 45[14 ff.]. The great exilic prophet, also, looked forward to a time when the gentiles would recognise Yahweh as the true God and the Jews as his peculiar people, and he undertook in the passage cited to portray them in their new relation. The result was hardly worthy of him. His Egyptians, Ethiopians and Sabaeans, as they come, bringing their costly gifts and casting themselves in chains at the feet of the servants of Yahweh, too evidently betray racial pride and resentment in the delineator. Zechariah is less extravagant. The events of the last twenty years have taught him respect, if not friendliness, for the nations. Still, he cannot deny his religion or abandon his faith in the final triumph of Yahweh over all false deities. *In those days*, he says, *ten men of all the tongues of the nations shall seize the skirt of a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that God is with you.* Note the pains he takes to use the name *God* in this connection. In this he imitates his exilic teacher. *Cf.* Is. 45[14]. The speech is a confession by the gentiles that they have finally found the Power after whom they have hitherto been blindly and vainly groping, the only Saviour, in the God of the Hebrews.

18. לאמר. 𝔊[אB] om.—יהיה] Probably the correct reading. Only 2 mss. have the pl. On the sg. after a pl. subj., see Ges. § 145. 2 (a).—שבים] 𝔊 adds *καὶ εὐφρανθήσεσθε* = ושמחתם. So 𝔖[H], but there seems to be no warrant for this reading.—**20.** עד] 𝔙 rds. עֹד, 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 עֹד. 𝔊 𝔖 ignore

אשר, which, if retained, must be construed as introducing a subject, not an object clause. *Cf.* v. [22] Ec. 5[4]; BDB., art. אשר, 8.—עמים] Kenn. 150 adds רבים. So 𝔊.—וישבי] 𝔖, by omitting ו, makes the prtc. an appositive of עמים.—**21.** ואחת] 𝔊^{BQ}, *πέντε πόλεις*, 𝔊^{ℵ*}, *πόλις πόλας καὶ συνελεύσονται κατοικοῦνται πέντε πόλεις*.—הלוך] The inf. abs. after a finite vb. *Cf.* Ges. § 113. 3 (b).—את יהוה] 𝔊 has *τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου* = את פני יהוה both here and in v. [22].—אלכה וג׳] 𝔗 introduces this reply by דין לדין יימר, *This one will say to that one.*—Ew. divides the verse after יהוה, thus making the second inf. לבקש dependent on אלכה. The whole clause ולבקש—צבאות, which should precede לחלות, is probably a gloss. *Cf.* v. [22].—**22.** גוים עצומים] 𝔊, *ἔθνα πολλά*; 𝔗, מלכין רברבין, as in Je. 25[14] 27[7].—**23.** אשר] See note on v. [20].—והחזיקו] Resumptive, after the long intervening subject. *Cf.* Dr. § 117. note.—עמכם] 𝔊 𝔖 render the sf. as if it were sg., but at the end of the verse (exc. 𝔊^A) have the pl. —שמענו] Add כי, with 2 mss. and 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE SECOND PART OF ZECHARIAH.

The book of Zechariah, so called, contains, besides the eight chapters universally attributed to the prophet of that name, six the origin and authorship of which have long been in dispute. The questions when and by whom they were written must therefore be discussed and, if possible, settled; but first it seems necessary to take a preliminary survey of the content of the chapters as a whole, and especially to inquire into the condition of the text as it has been transmitted by the Massoretes.

§ 1. THE STRUCTURE OF CHS. 9–14.

The ninth chapter begins with a word, משׂא, sometimes rendered *burden*, but more correctly *utterance*, which frequently appears in titles, especially in the book of Isaiah. *Cf.* 13^1 15^1, etc. It has generally been regarded as so used in this case, and, since another occurs in 12^1, as the title, or a part of it, of chs. 9–11. Thus it has been customary to divide Second Zechariah, as it is called, into two parts, each of which has three chapters, and, probably by accident rather than design, the same number (46) of verses. The genuineness of 12^1, however, is now pretty generally questioned. In its present form it is quite indefensible. Moreover, since the time of Ewald there have been those who have claimed that 13^{7-9} is the conclusion of $11^{4\text{ff.}}$. One cannot, therefore, take for granted the correctness of the Massoretic arrangement, but must reopen the case and make one's own analysis.

It must be remembered that the question concerns the arrangement, and not the authorship, of these chapters. If this distinction is kept in mind, there will not be much difficulty in deciding

that, whatever may be the case with the others, or any part of them, the first three chapters form a group with noticeable points of contact and connection. Thus the "also" of 9^{11} clearly indicates that, whoever may have written the preceding verses, the author of this one intended to connect them with what follows. The connection between $9^{11\text{ ff.}}$ and 10^{1}–11^{3} is unmistakable; for, besides the references to Israel in both passages, there is the peculiar metrical form in which they are cast to mark them as parts of one composition. The rest of ch. 11 has not the same form,—in fact, most of it is plain prose,—and there is room for doubt whether it is the work of the same author as the first verses; but it evidently owes its present position in the book of Zechariah to the fact that, like 10^{3}, it has for its subject worthless shepherds, and 13^{7-9} should be, and no doubt originally was, attached to it for the same reason.

Thus far there has been a traceable unity. Here, however, there comes a break, and from this point onward the marks that have been noted are conspicuously absent. The author of 12^{1}, therefore, whoever he was, was justified in introducing a new title. It suggests several questions. The only one germane to the present discussion is whether this title covers the rest of the book, 13^{7-9} excepted, or, rather, whether there is a connection between the parts of this latter half similar to that which has been traced through the first three chapters. There seems to be such a connection. At any rate, Jerusalem is prominent throughout as a centre of interest and anticipation. In 13^{2-6} this central point is for the time being lost sight of, but the passage can hardly be explained except as suggested by 12^{1}, where "the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem" are expressly mentioned. This being the case, one may still separate Second Zechariah into two divisions, the first consisting of chs. 9–11 and 13^{7-9}, and the second of 12^{1}–13^{6} and 14.

In the first division the first break naturally comes after 9^{10}. The place for the second is not so easy to determine. There are those who find none before the end of ch. 10. It is usual, however, to make one at the end of ch. 9 or after 10^{2}. Hitzig makes one at each of these two points. So also We., Now., Marti, *et al.* The matter is well put by Keil: "The close connection between v. ^{2b} and v. ^{3} shows that with v. ^{1} there commences a new line of thought,

for which, however, 9^{17} prepares the way." The third section, then, begins with 10^{1}. It includes 11^{1-3}, for (1) these last verses have the same metrical form as the preceding, and (2) they lose all significance unless they are so connected. The same may be said of 13^{7-9} in relation to 11^{4-17}. In this case the fact that, as v. Ortenberg points out,* 11^{16} is a parallel to Ez. 34^{4} and 13^{7} to Ez. 34^{5} confirms the inference from form and subject. It is suggested that the transfer of $13^{7\,ff.}$ to its present position in the Massoretic text was occasioned by a fancied relation between it and ch. 14.† Perhaps the reviser thought that the capture and destruction of Jerusalem foretold in 14^{1} was the fiery trial of 13^{9}. Whatever may have been the reason for it, the opinion that such a change has been made is widely held among biblical scholars.‡ The remainder, after the removal of $13^{7\,ff.}$, naturally divides itself into two sections, 12^{1}–13^{6} and 14.

§ 2. THE TEXT OF CHS. 9–14.

The text of the second, like that of the first, part of the book of Zechariah has undergone various changes, intentional or unintentional, some of which are of considerable importance. There seem to be more of them in the first two chapters than in the remaining four; but this may be only because the regularity of the rhythm in 9 *f.* makes it easier to detect those that have been made than in the prose, or less regular poetry, of the other chapters. There are here, as in First Zechariah, a number of cases in which more or less significant explanations have been added. See the phrase "the house of Judah" in 10^{3}. The last words of 9^{1} are of this character, and probably, also, the phrase "against the sons of Greece" in 9^{13} and the statement "a tiller of the soil am I" in 13^{5}. The instances of expansion are much more numerous. In some cases whole verses have been added. The following are good examples: in 9^{11}, "in which there is no water"; in 10^{8}, "for I have redeemed thee"; in 12^{2}, "and over Judah will he be also in the siege against Jerusalem." There are not many apparent corrections. The

* *Die Bestandtheile des Buches Sacharja*, 53 *f.*

† v. Ortenberg, *BBS.*, 55.

‡ So Sta., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.*

most notable is in 12^{10}, where, as will be explained in the critical notes, some one has undertaken to remedy an error by a copyist. The following table contains all the changes that have been noted, arranged in such a way as to show how the text should be restored when necessary.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
9, 1. וכל—ישראל		עין ארם for ערי ארם.
2. צר		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		רמיו for דמו (?); כאלף for כאֶלֶף.
8. The entire verse.		מִצְּבָה for מַצָּבָה.
9.		
10.		והכרתי for והכרית.
11. אין מים בו.		
12. לבצרון: גם היום מגיד		שובו for ושבו.
13. על בניך יון		בניך for בני.
14. ואדני		
15. צבאות : ואכלו : כמזרק		והמו for דמים.
16.	ירעה after כצאן; המה after נזר.	כי for כ.
17. The entire verse.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
9, 1. *and all the tribes of Israel.*		*the eye of man* for *the cities of Aram.*
2. *Tyre.*		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		pl. of *blood* for sg.; *chief* for *family.*
8. The entire verse.		*from an army* for *an outpost.*
9.		
10.		*he will*, for *I will*, *destroy.*
11. *with no water in it.*		
12. *for trouble; to-day, also, I declare.*		*return* (imv.) for *and shall return.*
13. *against the sons of Yawan.*		*Thy sons* for *the sons of* (*Yawan*).
14. *yea, the Lord.*		
15. *of Hosts; devour and; like a bowl.*		*and they shall rage* for *blood.*
16.	*will he feed; they* (*shall they be*) after *crown.*	*for* for *like.*
17. The entire verse.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
10, 1. בעת מלקוש		
2. וחלמות—ינחמון		נסעו for נסערו.
3. צבאות: את בית יהודה: במלחמה		
4. The entire verse.		
5.		כטיט for כטיש.
6. כי אני—ואענם		והושבותם for והשְׁבֹתם.
7.		יגל for וגל.
8. כי פריתים		
9. וחיו—ושבו		ואזרעם for ואזרם; וחָיו for וחִיו
10. ולבנון.		
11. והכה בים גלים		
12. The entire verse.		וגברתים for וגִבַּרתם; יתהלכו for יתהללו.
11, 1.		
2. הילל—שרדו		
3.		אדרתם for מרעיתם.
4.		אלהי for אלי.
5.		יאמר for יאמרו; וַאעשר for וָאֶעְשָׁר; רעיהם for רעיהו.
6.		
7.		לכן עניי for לכנעניי; חֹבלים for חֹבְלִים.
8. ואכחד—אחד		
9.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
10, 1. *in the time—rain.*		
2. *Yea, they speak—comfort.*		*moved* for *were scattered.*
3. *of Hosts; the house of Judah; in war.*		
4. The entire verse.		
5.		*in mire* for *as it were mire.*
6. *for I am—them.*		An ambiguous word for *I will even restore them.*
7.		*shall exult* for *and shall exult.*
8. *for I have redeemed them.*		
9. *and they shall rear—return.*		*sowed* for *scattered; live* for *rear.*
10. *and Lebanon.*		
11. *And he will smite—waves.*		
12. The entire verse.		*and I will make them mighty* for *and their might (shall be); walk* for *make their boast.*
11, 1.		
2. *Wail, cypress—devastated.*		
3.		*glory* for *pasture.*
4.		*my God* for *to me.*
5.		*says* for *say;* abnormal form of vb. *be rich; their,* mas. for fem.
6.		
7.		*therefore the poorest of* for *the traders in; binders* for *bonds.*
8. *and I destroyed—month.*		
9.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
11, 10.		להפיר for להפר.
11.		כן עניי for כנעניי.
12.		היוצר for האוצר, twice;
13.		יקרתי for יקרת.
14.		אולי for איל.
15.		
16.		הנכחדות for הנכחדת; הנער for והנעה; הנצבה for והנצבה or והרעבה; וכרעיהן for ופרסיהו
17.	יפל after חרב.	האליל for האויל.
13, 7. נאם—צבאות		הך for אכה or הכות without את; הצערים for הצערים.
8.		יגעו for ונגעו.
9.	ו before אמרתי.	
12, 1. משא—ישראל		על for אל.
2. תם—ירושלם		
3. ונאספו—הארץ		
4. ועל—עיני		
5.		אלפי for אלפי; לי ישבי for לישבי.
6. (בירושלם)—וישבה		אלפי for אלפי.
7.		בראשנה for כראשנה; ישב for ישבי.
8.		ישב for ישבי.
9.		
10. את		ישב for ישבי; אלי for אל; והמר for והסרו.

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
11, 10.			Irregular form of inf. (*break*).
11.			*Then the poorest of* for *the traders in.*
12.			
13.			*potter* for *treasury*. *I have*, for *thou hast*, *been valued.*
14.			
15.			Irreg. form of adj. (*foolish*).
16.			*Those that are*, for *the one that is, being destroyed; the young* for *and the one that is wandering; the one that surviveth* for *and the one that surviveth* or *hungereth; hoofs* for *legs.*
17.		*shall fall* after *sword.*	*worthless* (*of worthlessness*) for *foolish.*
13, 7.	*saith—Hosts.*		*smite* for *I will smite;* prtc. for adj. (*little ones*).
8.			*and* before *die.*
9.		*Then* before *will I say.*	
12, 1.	*An oracle—Israel.*		*against* for *to.*
2.	*and over Judah —Jerusalem.*		
3.	*and there shall be gathered—earth.*		
4.	*and upon the house—eyes.*		
5.			*chiefs* for *families; strength for me the inhabitants* for *strength for the inhabitants.*
6.	*but Jerusalem—* (*in Jerusalem*).		*chiefs* for *families.*
7.			*first* for *as at first*; *inhabitant* for *inhabitants.*
8.			*inhabitant* for *inhabitants.*
9.			
10.	Sign of the acc.		*inhabitant* for *inhabitants*; *me* for *him*; inf. for fin. vb. (*grieve*).

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
12, 11.		
12.	ונשיהם לבר after ילבר.	משפחות for משפחַת twice.
13.		
14.		משפחֹת for משפחַת twice.
13, 1.		לחטאת for לחטָּאת.
2. צבאות		
3.		
4. בהנבאתו	עוד after ילבשו.	
5. איש—אנכי		ארם הקנני for אדמה קניני.
6.		ידיך for צדיך.
14, 1.		
2.		
3.		כיום for כמו.
4. ביום ההוא: אשר—מקדם: [2]הר הזתים		
5. ינסתם—יהודה	ו before כל.	ונסתם for ונְסַתֶּם; גיא הרי for גיחון; אצל for אצלו; קרשים for אלהיך; אלהי for קרשיו; עמך for עמו.
6.		אור for עוד; יקרות for וקרות; יקפאון for וקפאון.
7. הוא—ליהוה		
8.		
9. The entire verse.		
10. יער—הראשון		יסוב for וסב (?); ומגרל for וסמגרל.
11. וישבו בה		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

	ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
12, 11.			
12.		*and their women alone* after *themselves.*[1]	*families by themselves* for *each family by themselves.*
13.			
14.			*families by themselves* for *each family by themselves.*
13, 1.			Const. for abs. of *sin.*
2.	*of Hosts.*		
3.			
4.	*when he prophesieth.*	*longer* before *wear.*	
5.	*A tiller—I.*		*man hath sold me* for *the soil hath been my possession.*
6.			*thy hands* for *thy sides.*
14, 1.			
2.			
3.			*as in the day* for *as.*
4.	*in that day; which—eastward; the mount of Olives.*[2]		
5.	*Ye shall flee—Judah.*	*and* before *all.*	*ye shall flee by the gorge of my mountains* for *Gihon shall be stopped; Asal and* for *the side of it; my God* for *thy God; the holy ones* for *his holy ones; with thee* for *with him.*
6.			*light* for *longer; precious things shall contract* for *cold and frost.*
7.	*it is known to Yahweh.*		
8.			
9.	The entire verse.		
10.	*to the site of the first gate.*	*from* before *the tower.*	*And* at the beginning changed to preformative of the impf.
11.	*and they shall dwell in it.*		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
14, 12.		תָּמֵק for הָמֵק; כפיהם for כפיהו.
13.		יד רעהו for ברעהו.
14. סביב		ואסף for וְאָסְפָה.
15.		
16.		
17.		
18. ולא: אשר לא— הסכות	כל before הגוים	ולא באה for ובאה or ולא תבא.
19.		
20.		על for כל
21.		

THE TEXT OF ZECHARIAH, IX–XIV.

ADDITIONS.	OMISSIONS.	ERRORS.
14, 12.		Hiph. for Niph.; *their*, inf. pl. for distributive.
13.		A faulty construction of *hand*.
14. *round*.		*there shall be collected* for *they shall collect*.
15.		
16.		
17.		
18. *then* before *on them* (?); the following *not*; *that come—tabernacles*.	*all* before *the nations*.	*have not presented themselves* for *present themselves* or *present not themselves*.
19.		
20.		*on* for *all*.
21.		

§ 3. THE AUTHORSHIP OF CHS. 9–14.

The object of the above attempt to restore the original text of the chapters under examination was to furnish a reliable basis for further inquiry. There are several questions that demand consideration. The first is whether these chapters are the work of the same author as the preceding eight. Tradition says that they all came from Zechariah the son of Iddo, and this was for centuries the unanimous belief among both Jews and Christians. In this case, as in that of the Pentateuch, the impulse to criticism was given by a defender of the Scriptures. More than a hundred years before Astruc published his famous *Conjectures*, Joseph Mede († 1638), in explanation of Mt. $27^{9\,f.}$, where a quotation from Zc. 11^{12} is attributed to Jeremiah, ventured to question tradition. These are his words: "Nay, indeed, there is reason to suspect that the Holy Spirit [through Matthew] desired to claim these three chapters, 9, 10, 11, for their real author. For there are a great many things in them which, if one carefully consider them, seem not to suit the time of Zechariah as well as that of Jeremiah."* This modest suggestion did not at once attract attention, but finally, in 1700, it was adopted and extended by Bishop Kidder, who said of chs. 12–14, "This is certain, that such things are contained in these chapters as agree with the time of Jeremiah, but by no means with that of Zechariah."† He was followed by William Whiston in a work‡ denounced as "a monstrosity" by Carpzov,§ who thus inaugurated a controversy which has had more than two sides, and still remains unsettled.

There was a time when the title at the beginning of the book of Zechariah was considered a sufficient guarantee of its unity, but since it has been generally recognised that many of the prophecies once attributed to Isaiah were written by another person or persons of a much later period an argument of this sort has ceased to be convincing. It is the internal evidence, if there is any, on which

* *Dissertationum ecclesiast. triga*, 1653.
† *The Demonstration of the Messiah*, ii, 199.
‡ *An Essay Towards Restoring the True Text of the Old Testament*, 1722.
§ *Crit. Sac.*, 781.

a safe conclusion must be based. When, therefore, the question arises whether the prophet who wrote the first eight chapters of Zechariah is the author of the last six also, the way to settle it is to compare the two parts the one with the other in their most noticeable features. In this case, since the peculiarities of the style and content of the first part have already been noted, it is only necessary to examine the second to see if the same features, or any considerable number of them, are reproduced in these last chapters. If they are not, that is, if the author who reveals himself there is not recognisable as the son of Iddo, the unity of the book called by his name must be abandoned.

The first thing noted concerning the prophecies attributed to Zechariah was that, like those of Haggai, they were all dated, and, moreover, that they contained references to persons and events which made it possible to verify the dates given. Now, there are no dates in the last six chapters, nor is there an open reference to any person or event by which a date can be fixed. Indeed, the author, if there be but one, seems at times purposely to have avoided the mention of names, thus making his utterances riddles to his modern, and doubtless to some of his earliest readers. See especially $11^{4\,ff.}$.

In view of what has just been said, one does not expect to find the first person used here as it is in the first eight chapters. There, it will be remembered, the regular form of introduction was, "Then came the word of Yahweh of Hosts to me." Here the first person occurs only in $11^{4\,ff.}$, where the introductory formula (v. ^{4}) is a strange cross between the one heretofore used and another favourite with Zechariah, the result being, "Thus said Yahweh to me."* See also "Then said Yahweh to me" in vv. $^{13.\,15}$.

The fondness of Zechariah for visions was found to be one of his prominent characteristics. There are no visions in the last six chapters, and this fact has sometimes been cited as proof that these chapters were not written by him; unfairly, however, since the absence of visions from chs. 7 and 8 is not regarded as a mark of ungenuineness, and their occurrence in chs. 9–14 would not mean that Zechariah wrote these chapters, unless it could be shown that

* The Massoretic text has "my God."

the given visions were used in the manner, and for the same purpose, traceable in the first part of the book. If they revealed an apocalyptical tendency, since, as has been shown, Zechariah was by no means visionary, they would have a contrary significance.

The next point to be considered is the literary form in which are cast the last six chapters as compared with the first eight. It was found that in the earlier chapters the prophet wrote in rather monotonous prose, only now and then, sometimes apparently almost unconsciously, adopting a more or less regular rhythmical movement. The ninth chapter at first promises little better, but, by supplying a few words that have evidently been lost and omitting more that have just as evidently been added, vv. $^{1-10}$ are transformed into a succession of double tristichs almost as regular as the lines of Second Isaiah. There are six of these stanzas. The first part of the poem, in form as well as in content, strongly recalls Am. $1^{3\,ff.}$; for, if the introductory phrase and the useless gloss "of iron" in v. ^{3} be omitted, there will remain in the judgment on Syria nine regular lines, or, as Harper divides them, three tristichs.* In vv. $^{6-8}$ there are three more.† The remaining judgments are not so regular, in the form in which they have been transmitted, but each of them has at least one tristich. It is this prevailingly triple arrangement which the author of Zc. 9^{1-10} follows, and that with a regularity which would probably not have been attempted by a more original writer.

With 9^{11}, as has been explained, begins a new section, and from this point onward there is a different literary form. Not that the writer, if the same, here passes from poetry to prose. He still measures his words, and, indeed, by the three-toned rule, but he now puts four lines, instead of twice three, into a stanza, and this arrangement is continued as far as v. ^{3} of the eleventh chapter. These are significant facts, and they admit of but one interpretation. It is clear that, if Zechariah wrote the first eight chapters of the book called by his name, he cannot have written the sections

* Harper, by including the introductory formula and the above-mentioned gloss, gets one irregular stanza of five lines.

† In this case there is another gloss "to deliver to Edom," besides a "Thus saith the Lord Yahweh" at the beginning, and a "saith the Lord Yahweh" at the end, of the section to be eliminated.

(9^{1}–11^{3}) that have just been described. They constitute an elaborate poem; he in his undoubted writings never attempted to put together a dozen lines.

The next section (11^{4-17} and 13^{7-9}) consists mainly of a prose narrative, to which are added a few lines in a movement somewhat different from that of chs. 9 and 10. These lines, which are variations on a six-toned model, form four tristichs, one at the end of ch. 11, the others in the transposed passage. The fact that they resemble one another in structure shows that 13^{7-9} should follow ch. 11, but since the same measure appears in 3^{7}, the use of it here is favourable rather than unfavourable to the authorship of Zechariah.

The conclusion with reference to chs. 12 and 14 must be that, although they are on the whole more rhythmical than the first eight, there is no sustained movement, like that in chs. 9 and 10, which by its regularity forces itself upon the reader's attention.

Marti says of 12^{1}–13^{6}, "It is impossible to discover in this section a single and consistent metrical form. The description of the lamentation in 12^{11-14} is a repetition of the same words so stereotyped that numerical prevail over poetical considerations, and the statement concerning the prophetic order in 13^{2-6} follows in the language of prose. The rest seems modelled after the type of the tristich, but the lines in the tristichs are not throughout of the same length." He then proceeds, by additions and omissions, often arbitrary and sometimes inconsistent, to adjust the text to his theory. In point of fact, although it is possible in this way to produce a succession of approximately equal lines, there are only a few places in ch. 12 where there is any ground for supposing that the author consciously measured his words as he wrote. One of these is v. ^{4}, where, strangely enough, Marti throws the measure into confusion by including the introductory formula, and substitutes an evident gloss for an equally evident parallel to the main proposition. See the comments; also on vv. $^{6.\ 8.\ 10.\ 12\ f.}$.

In ch. 14 Marti discovers a scheme of tetrastichs. Three of these he constructs out of the first five verses by rejecting the whole of v. ^{3}, nearly half of v. ^{4} and more than half of v. ^{5}, and leaving a lacuna to be supplied in each of the last two verses; but it will puzzle most readers to find traces of poetical form, except at the beginning and the end of the passage, and here it seems to be unintentional. The same is true of the occasional lines in the remaining verses of the chapter.

The comparison between the first and second parts of Zechariah as respects literary form must now be supplemented by a more

minute inquiry, namely, whether the forms of expression characteristic of Zechariah as the author of chs. 1–8 recur in the last six chapters under similar circumstances.

The following are the facts:

"The word of Yahweh came to me," the formula by which the prophet regularly introduces his messages, does not occur in these chapters. In 11⁴ the corresponding formula is, "Thus said Yahweh to me."

"Thus saith (said) Yahweh," with (17) or without (2) "of Hosts," is also conspicuous by its absence, the case just cited not being parallel.

"Saying," which is noticeably frequent (29 t.) in the first eight chapters, and would naturally have been used in 11⁴ ff., occurs neither there nor elsewhere in the last six.

The appeal to the future, "Then shall ye know," etc., is used 4 t. in the first part of the book, but not at all in the second.

"The Lord of the whole earth" is a title for God that would have suited the thought of these last chapters, but it is not used, "the King, Yahweh of Hosts," being substituted for it.

Zechariah makes large use of rhetorical questions, but there is only one question of any sort after the eighth chapter.

The use of the participle, with or without a preceding *behold*,* or in an adverbial sense, is frequent (29 t.) in chs. 1–8. Here it is used in all only 12 t.

A number of words were found to be characteristic of Zechariah. They are the following: אני, the shorter form of the pron. of the first person singular, is used exclusively in the first, but only 2 out of 6 t. in the second, part of the book. בחר, in the sense of *take pleasure*, is not found where it might be expected, even in ch. 14. זמם, *purpose*, also, is wanting. חלה, *appease*, might have been used in $14^{16.\ 18}$, but השתחוה was preferred. קרא is not found in the sense of *proclaim* in these chapters. שארית, *remnant*, is wanting, יתר being used in 14² in its place. שוב, *return*, where it might be used adverbially in the sense of *again*, is replaced by עוד. שכן, *dwell*, is used like ישב, of both God and men in chs. 1–8. In chs. 9–14 only the latter occurs, and that 12 t. תוך, *midst*, very common in chs. 1–8, does not occur in 9–14, קרב being employed in its place.

Various other words are cited by Eckardt,† but these are enough to show that the vocabulary of chs. 9–14 differs appreciably from that of 1–8 in respects in which they ought to agree, if they were written by the same perrson.

In the examination of chs. 1–8 it was noted that Zechariah repeatedly referred to "the former prophets." There are no such references in chs. 9–14. This, however, does not mean that there

* הנה.

† *ZAW*., 1893, 104 *ff*.

are no points of contact between these chapters and other prophetic writings. There are, and more of them than there are in the first part of the book.

The following is a list, based on those by Stade and others, of passages in the case of which there may be any kind or degree of dependence, with the passages to which the first are related (Stade, *ZAW*., 1881, 41 *ff*.; Kuiper, *Zach. ix–xvi*, 101 *ff*.; Staerk, *Untersuchungen*, 18 *ff*.):

9^{1}, if it is "the word" that is on the land of Hadrak, has a parallel in Is. $9^{8/7}$. 9^{2} in its original form contained no reference to Tyre, yet there is evidently a relation of dependence between it and Ez. 28^{3}. $9^{3\,f.}$ has the same subject, the same measure and the same number of lines as Am. $9^{9\,f.}$. The variations from the latter passage are in harmony with Ez. 28^{10}. 9^{5-7} is just as clearly related to Am. 1^{6-8}. The phrase "to deliver them to Edom" in v. ^{6}, like "to Edom" in v. ^{9}, is an explanatory gloss suggested by Ez. 35^{5}. Comp. Harper. There are also reminders of Is. 20^{5} Je. 25^{20}. 9^{9} has behind it a long course of development. The passages of which its phraseology first reminds one are Je. 23^{5} Zp. $3^{14\,f.}$ Is. 61^{10} 62^{11}. *Cf*. also Is. 49^{4} $50^{7\,ff.}$. 9^{10}. The language is that of Mi. $5^{9/10}$, but the thought is more nearly in harmony with 4^{3}. $9^{11\,f.}$ recall Is. 42^{7}, but especially $61^{1.\,7}$. On v. ^{12}, see Is. 40^{1}. "For trouble" is a gloss bringing the passage into closer harmony with its parallel. 9^{14} describes a theophany, but it does not resemble that of Ex. $19^{16\,ff.}$ so much as that of Jos. $10^{10\,f.}$ or that of 1 S. 7^{10}. $9^{16\,ff.}$. Yahweh is frequently represented as a shepherd by the prophets, but the most elaborate of these passages, and the one most nearly related to this one, is Ez. $34^{11\,ff.}$. 10^{1}. The succession, lightning, rain, herbage is found also in Jb. $38^{25\,ff.}$. *Cf*. also 28^{26}. 10^{2}. If 9^{16} betrays dependence on Ez. $34^{11\,f.}$, it is probable that this verse was influenced by Ez. $34^{5\,f.}$. *Cf*. also Je. $23^{1\,f.}$. 10^{3} combines Je. 23^{2} and Ez. $34^{10.\,17}$. At the end one is reminded of Jb. $39^{19\,ff.}$. 10^{5}. If the following verses betray acquaintance with Is. $11^{11\,ff.}$, this one will be only another way of putting the thought of 11^{14}. 10^{6}. If 10^{3} was in part suggested by Je. 23^{2}, this verse must be a reminiscence of Je. 23^{6} Is. $11^{12\,f.}$. 10^{8} continues the thought of Je. 23^{3}. *Cf*. also Is. 7^{18} 27^{13}. $10^{9\,f.}$. The thought is more than once expressed in earlier writings. *Cf*. Je. 23^{8} Ho. 11^{1} Is. 11^{11} Mi. $7^{14\,f.}$. 10^{11} has a strong resemblance to Is. 11^{15}. $11^{1.\,2b}$. The representation of great men or nations by great trees is a common figure. The passage most resembling this one is Is. 2^{13}. *Cf*. also Ju. 9^{15}. 11^{3} looks like an imitation of Je. $25^{36.\,38}$. On the "pride of the Jordan," see Je. 12^{5}.

11^{4}. On "the flock for slaughter," see Je. 12^{3}. 11^{5} combines features of Ez. 34^{3} Je. 50^{7} Ho. $12^{9/8}$. 11^{7}. If 11^{5} was suggested by Ho. $12^{9/8}$, probably "the traders" of this verse are from Ho. $12^{8/7}$. For the "staves," see Ez. $37^{15\,ff.}$. 11^{9} looks like an imitation of Ez. $34^{3\,f.}$. *Cf*. also v. ^{16}. 11^{11}. *Cf*. v. ^{7}. 11^{12}. The amount is the same as in Ex. 21^{32}. 11^{16}. *Cf*. v. ^{9}. 11^{17}. The language is that of Je. $50^{35\,ff.}$, but the thought seems to be that of Ez. 30^{21}. 13^{7} has the thought of Ez. $34^{7\,ff.}$, with various additions. *Cf*. also Is. 1^{25}. 13^{8} resembles in form Ez. 5^{12}. 13^{9}. "I will smelt thee" recalls Is. 1^{25}; also 48^{10}. The latter half of the verse is more like Ho. $2^{25/23}$. *Cf*. Ez. 36^{28} $37^{23.\,27}$.

12^1, in part almost Is. 51^{12}, more freely reproduces a part of 42^5. 12^2. "The cup of reeling" is a familiar figure. In this case the writer combines the thought of Je. 51^7 and $25^{20 ff.}$. 12^4. The three nouns are found in Dt. 28^{28}. 12^6 recalls Is. $9^{19/20}$. 12^8. The thought is that of Is. $31^{4 f.}$. *Cf.* also Dt. 4^{37}; perhaps Is. $63^{11 ff.}$. 12^9, if it refers to the protection of the city, furnishes a parallel to Is. 31^5 or $17^{12 ff.}$. 12^{10}. The Spirit works reformation, as in Ez. $36^{26 f.}$. *Cf.* also Je. 6^{26}. 13^1 also reminds one of Ezekiel. *Cf.* $36^{25.17}$. 13^2 recalls Ez. 36^{25}; also Ho. $2^{19/17}$. 13^3 has points of resemblance with Dt. $13^{6 ff.}$.

14^1. The peculiar expression "a day to Yahweh" occurs Is. 2^{12} Ez. 30^3. 14^2. There are various features which ch. 14 has in common with Ez. 38. This verse corresponds to v. [16] of that passage rather than Jo. $4/3^{12}$. *Cf.* also Ez. 39^2. $14^{4 f.}$. This theophany strongly resembles that of Dt. 33^2. The whole follows v. [2] as Ez. $38^{19 f.}$ follow v. [16]. 14^7 is only another way of putting the thought of Is. 30^{26} and $60^{19 f.}$. 14^8. Another form of the picture of Ez. $47^{1 ff.}$. *Cf.* also Jo. $4/3^{18}$. 14^{10}. Like Mi. 4^1 (Is. 2^2), but more literal. *Cf.* also Je. 31^{38}. 14^{11}. The first clause in a modified form is found in Je. 33^{16}, but the thought is more fully elaborated in Ez. 34^{25-29}. 14^{12}. An enlargement on the "pestilence" of Ez. 38^{22}. 14^{13} is the equivalent of Ez. 38^{21}. 14^{14} corresponds to Ez. 39^{10}. 14^{16} holds a middle position between Mi. $4^{1 ff.}$ (Is. $2^{2 ff.}$) and Je. 3^{17}, on the one hand, and Is. 66^{23} on the other. $14^{20 f.}$. The sanctity of Jerusalem is repeatedly predicted in the earlier prophetical writings: for example, Je. 31^{40}. On the legend quoted, see Ex. 28^{36}. *Cf.* also Jo. $4/3^{17}$.

In the remarks accompanying the above list care has been taken to avoid the question whether the passages cited from chs. 9–14 are dependent on those that they more or less closely resemble or *vice versa*.

This is not the place to discuss the relative date of these chapters. It is proper, however, to note at this point some facts with reference to the list as compared with that in the Introduction to chs. 1–8.

The first thing that one will naturally notice is that this list is nearly twice as long as the other. This fact, however, has not so much significance as might at first sight be supposed, since so much of the first part is occupied by the visions that it really furnishes only about half as large a field for possible reference to other writings as the second. The most interesting feature of this list, therefore, is not the number of points of contact with other books it contains, but the distribution of the passages to which those cited may with more or less reason be regarded as parallels. The facts are as follows: There are none from Haggai. There are relatively fewer from Micah, Jeremiah and Second Isaiah, and only about as many from Amos and First Isaiah; but there are twice as many from Hosea and

almost three times as many from Ezekiel. Note also that in this list Job appears twice and Deuteronomy three times. These are interesting items. One of them has a bearing on the present object. It is the absence of any apparent acquaintance with Haggai; which certainly is not favourable to the opinion that Zechariah is the author of these as of the first eight chapters.

The comparison between the first and second parts of the book can, and should, be carried beyond mere externals. In doing so it will be necess ry again to refer to the visions, not, however, this time, as literary devices, but as a source of information concerning the ideas directly or indirectly taught by Zechariah. In the Introduction to the first eight chapters it was noted that the prophet not only describes himself as receiving instruction through an angelic interpreter, but that he represents Yahweh as generally hiding himself from human eyes and employing angels to deliver and execute his decrees among men. In chs. 9–14 there is a different conception of God's ways. It shows itself in 9^{14}, where, indeed, "the holy ones" are mentioned, but as the attendants, not the messengers, of Yahweh. In fact, this chapter is an excellent example of biblical apocalyptic, the most prominent features of which are the sudden and terrific appearance of the Deity to rescue his people in their extremity and the immediate transformation of existing conditions for their benefit. As such it is unlike anything in the first eight chapters.

Apocalyptic has other striking characteristics. Charles (*DB.*, art. *Apocalyptic Literature*) mentions three. In the first place, it "despises the present." Such pessimism finds expression especially in $11^{6.\,9}$, where the writer warns his people that the best of them must still go through fiery affliction, and 14^{1}, where even the capture of their holy city is predicted. There is nothing of this kind in chs. 1–8. Zechariah, it is true, acknowledges that his present is a day of "small things," but he sees hope in it, and expects the change to come, not by an external fiat, but through internal improvement. Indeed, in ch. 8 he already finds the good time coming, and encourages his people to recognise it by transforming their fasts into seasons of "joy and rejoicing." *Cf.* v. ^{19}.

Another characteristic of apocalyptic is "an indefinitely wider view" than is usual in prophecy. Here it sees, first, "all the peoples round" (12^4), and then "all the nations" (14^2), gathering against the insignificant city of Jerusalem, only to be repulsed and overthrown at sight of Yahweh. This also is unlike Zechariah. There is no hint of it in any of his recognised prophecies. In fact, by the time the last of them was written, or uttered, he knew that no such riot among the nations as Ezekiel pictures was possible. He seems to have been content if his people might enjoy, as they did, the semblance of self-government under the ægis of the king of Persia.

Finally, according to Charles, apocalyptic is characterised by "ruthless cruelty" in the fate predicted for the enemies of the Chosen People. He does not refer to the "fire" and the "sword" with which the prophets generally threaten their own as well as surrounding nations, but to tortures which are the hideous and dreadful reflection of the things the Jews suffered from their oppressors. There is a trace of such cruelty in 9^{15} and 11^7, but it is most apparent in $14^{12.\ 15}$, where, as in Is. 66^{24}, the writer seems to gloat over the agonies described. This certainly is not the spirit that dictated the twice-given exhortation, "Devise not evil one against another in your hearts" (7^{10} 8^{17}), and which represents the nations as flocking to Jerusalem, not from fear of a threatened plague (14^7), but because they have heard that God has revealed himself there. *Cf.* 8^{22}.

The last point recalls a term used in the Introduction to the first eight chapters to indicate one of the most noticeable characteristics of Zechariah and his utterances. It was *sobriety*. It certainly cannot be used of these last chapters as a whole. The term *extravagance* would better suit some, at least, of them. Nor is the cruelty displayed the only evidence to this effect. It appears in the writer's picture of the future. In the matter of the extent of the Messianic kingdom the data are conflicting. Thus, from chs. 9 *f.* it would appear that the writer claimed as the final heritage of his people all that was ever promised them, from the land of Hadrak in the north to the desert south of Gaza (9^{1-7}), so extended a domain, and more, being required because the tribes of Israel as

well as Judah are to be restored to their country. *Cf.* $10^{6.\ 10}$. In chs. 12–14, as in the first eight, nothing is said of Israel, but in 14^{10} the land of which Jerusalem is the capital is described as extending only from Geba on the north to Rimmon on the south of the city, that is, as including only the territory of the earlier kingdom of Judah. These two forecasts are irreconcilable the one with the other. Moreover, if Zechariah wrote chs. 1–8, he can hardly be the author of either of them.

The teaching of chs. 9–14 differs from that of the first eight with reference to the head of the future kingdom. Zechariah declares the promise concerning him fulfilled in Zerubbabel, a prince already born and present in the community. *Cf.* 4^{9} $6^{12\,f.}$. From 9^{1-10}, on the other hand, one learns that he has not yet appeared, that, in fact, he will not appear until the country over which he is destined to rule has been subdued for him. There are no other references to him; for $11^{4\,ff.}$ is anything but a Messianic prophecy, while in ch. 12 it is the whole house of David, and not any particular member of it, who is to be "like God" and "like the angel of Yahweh" before the people.

The modesty of Zechariah's expectations concerning conditions in general in the future has been noted. He promises his people only that they shall have a peace and prosperity that permits long and happy lives. In ch. 9 also peace is promised, but here the promise includes "the nations." Thus far there has been no serious divergence, but according to ch. 14 when Yahweh comes to the relief of Jerusalem all things will become new. The sun will hover over Judea, banishing cold and darkness and making an endless summer day. At the same time the rugged and often barren hills will smooth themselves into a plain through which eastward and westward will flow perennial streams to fructify the soil. Even if this picture is to be taken figuratively, there is still difference enough between it and the idyllic description of ch. 8 to warrant one in hesitating to attribute both to the same author.

Finally, it remains to compare the emphasis on ethical matters in the first, and the lack of it in the second, part of the book. In his insistence on justice and other social virtues, as has been shown, Zechariah in the undoubted prophecies is a worthy follower of

Amos and Isaiah. The same cannot be said for the author, or authors, of chs. 9–14. In fact, although there are a few passages from which one may infer a regard for justice and kindness, especially toward Jews, there are no ethical precepts. On the other hand, the matter of sanctity, in the sense of exclusive devotion to Yahweh and freedom from ceremonial uncleanness, is prominent, and the motto of the new order, according to 14^{20} is not mutual good-will, but "Holiness to Yahweh," even in the bells of the horses. It is clear that Zechariah, though a priest, after having written ch. 8, would hardly in his last message to his people have put so much stress upon externals.

The conclusion to which this comparison points is unmistakable; yet, before closing the case, it is only fair to consider the arguments for the Zecharian authorship of chs. 9–14 with which Robinson concludes his discussion. (*The Prophecies of Zechariah*, 87 *ff*.) He claims (1) that "the fundamental ideas of both parts are the same," giving certain specifications. (a) "An unusually deep, spiritual tone." The passages cited from chs. 9–14 are 9^7 10^{12} 12^{10} $14^{8.\,20\,f.}$. Of these 10^{12} is an addition to the text and 14^8 a description of one of the physical features of the new Judah. The others reveal, it is true, a zeal for religion, but in only one of them (12^{10}) is there any indication of spiritual experience. (b) "A similar attitude of hope and expectation, notably concerning (α) the return of the whole nation." This, as has been shown, is a prevailing idea in chs. 9–11, but nowhere else is there a genuine reference to Israel. (β) "Jerusalem shall be inhabited." Note, however, that, as has been explained, the Jerusalem of 14^{16}, perched aloft over an unbroken plain, is not the Jerusalem of chs. 1–8. (γ) "The temple shall be built." It is only in the first part that the temple is still in process of erection. In 13^2 it is evidently already completed; nor is there, either in this passage or elsewhere in the second part, anything to forbid the assumption that worship therein has long since been resumed. (δ) The "Messianic hope is peculiarly strong." This is true, but, as has been shown, the "king" of ch. 9 is not the "Shoot" of the first part. (ε) "Peace and prosperity are expected." This also is only partially correct; for 10^{17} has the only reference in chs. 9–14 to the material benefits for which Zechariah looked, and it is an adddition to the text. (ζ) "The idea of God's providence as extending to the whole earth." Note, however, as has been shown, that the method by which he governs the world is by no means the same in both parts. (c) "The prophet's attitude toward Judah." See the criticism on (b) (α). (d) "The prophet's attitude toward the nations." It has been shown that the tone of the second part, especially chs. 11 and 14, is much more stern and cruel than that of chs. 1–8, and that, whereas in ch. 8 the nations are drawn to Jerusalem, according to ch. 14 they are driven thither.

(2) Robinson claims further that "there are peculiarities of thought common to both parts." The specifications are as follows: (a) "The habit of

dwelling on the same thought." The passages cited from chs. 1–8 are $2^{14\,f.}/^{10\,f.}$ $6^{12.\,13}$ $8^{4.\,5.\,21.\,22}$; which, however, do not justify the statement based on them, for in both $2^{14\,f.}/^{10\,f.}$ and $6^{12\,f.}$ one of the identical clauses is an accretion, in $8^{4\,f.}$ the scenes described are not the same and in 8^{21} the clause "and to seek," etc., is probably a gloss borrowed from v. ^{22}, while in this latter verse the repetition of "to appease Yahweh" is not a peculiarity of Zechariah, but a familiar feature of Hebrew composition of which there are several examples in the first chapter of Genesis. (b) "The habit of expanding one fundamental thought into the unusual number of five parallel clauses." This, too, is entirely mistaken. The first case cited from chs. 1–8 is 6^{13}, where there are indeed five lines, but the last five of a stanza of six, the first having, through the carelessness of the Massoretes, been attached to the preceding verse. *Cf.* 3^7. In 1^{17} the five clauses are not parallel, the first two being merely introductory and the last three a complete tristich. In 3^8 the latter half of the verse is a gloss, and in the next verse the arrangement is evidently accidental. In the passages cited from chs. 9–14 there is still less support for the supposed peculiarity. (c) "The habit of referring to a thought already introduced" is only another name for the tendency to favour certain ideas or expressions. It can have no bearing on the question at issue unless the thoughts or expressions are the same. Since, therefore, Robinson makes this claim in only three instances (3^9 and 13^2; 3^9 and 14^{16}; 5^2 and 14^{10}), and in all of them unwarrantably, the point can hardly be regarded as well taken. (d) "The use made of the cardinal number two." It is plain that such a usage can be called a peculiarity only when it is more or less arbitrary, which it is not in any of the cases cited except 9^{12}, where the writer is borrowing from a predecessor. (e) "The resort to symbolic actions"; a favourite method of instruction with the prophets, of which there are only two examples in each part of the book. (f) "The habit of drawing lessons from the past." The passages cited from chs. 1–8 which really illustrate this point all contain references to "the former prophets," of which, as has been shown, there is no instance in chs. 9–14.

(3) Another indication of unity in the book of Zechariah, according to Robinson, is found in "certain peculiarities of diction and style." Under this head he first quotes a list of words common to both parts from Eckardt, to which he adds twelve words and phrases. *Cf. ZAW.*, 1893, 104. Two of those given by Eckardt, נגע and עור, are omitted by Robinson. Of these twelve one, איש, with אח, is used only in the first part, one, כמוה, is an error of the first part, and five, אחר. יסר. שער. חן. רוי, are differently used in the two parts, while four, מאת. אדמה. בת ציון. על ימין, of the remaining five are so common that their absence would be more noticeable than their appearance in either part. Of the original list Eckardt himself says that these points of contact "which are, in fact, not more numerous than those between Zechariah and any other prophet, are insignificant in comparison with the differences between him and the author of the second part of the book"; and he follows this statement with a longer list of words used in different senses or instead of each other in the two parts. In conclusion he says, "These differences would be enough to prove that chs. 9–14 cannot have come from the same author as chs. 1–8." In this conclusion Robinson refuses to concur; but his reasons are not convincing. For example, in two of the three cases in which he finds similar modes of expression in both parts his arguments are based on inter-

polations; of the fifteen vocatives cited from the two parts only nine are clear cases of apostrophe; and of the examples of clumsy diction, those (3) of the second part are all from 12^{12-14}, where formal repetition is in order. Finally, in view of the variations in the use or neglect of the vowel letters, it is hardly safe to regard the occurrence of nine cases of inconsistency in the first part of the book and five in the second, all of which may be mistakes of copyists, as "one of the strongest evidences that it was all written by one hand."

(4) The next argument is that "Zc. 1–8 shows familiarity with the same books of prophecy so often quoted by the author of chs. 9–14"; the answer to which is that, as has been shown, although most of the books with which parallels may be found are the same, the number of coincidences with some of them is very different.

(5) The final argument used by Robinson, "the variety of critical opinion," is obviously weak, since the critics, however widely they may differ from one another on the date of chs. 9–14, are almost unanimous in denying that they can have been written by Zechariah.

Having thus shown the weakness of the arguments for the traditional view with reference to the authorship of the book of Zechariah, it is time to consider the critical opinions that have been reached by modern scholarship.

Mede, the first to break with tradition, attributed chs. 9–11 to Jeremiah, his reasons being (1) that there is really no scriptural authority for insisting that Zechariah wrote them, but (2) that there is such authority in Mt. 27^9 for attributing them to Jeremiah, and (3) that their content is of a character to justify the belief that he was their author. Mede's earliest followers differed from him only in applying his reasoning to the remaining chapters of the book, but Archbishop Newcome* made a new departure, maintaining that chs. 9–14 must be divided, chs. 9–11 being considerably earlier than the rest. This is his statement:

"The last six chapters are not expressly assigned to Zechariah; are unconnected with those which precede; the three first of them are unsuitable in many parts to the time when Zechariah lived; all of them have a more adorned and poetical turn of composition than the eight first chapters; and they manifestly break the unity of the prophetical book. I conclude from internal marks in c. ix. x. xi. that these three chapters were written much earlier than the time of Jeremiah, and before the captivity of the ten tribes. Israel is mentioned, c. ix. 1, xi. 14; Ephraim c. ix. 10, 13, x. 7; and Assyria c. x. 10, 11. . . . They seem to suit Hosea's age and manner. . . . The xiith, xiiith, and xivth chapters form a distinct prophecy, and were written after the death of Josiah; c. xii. 11. . . . I incline to think that the author lived before the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. See on c. xiii. 2–6."

* *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, 1785.

The view thus stated found a friendly reception on the Continent, where the way had been prepared for it by Flügge's more radical hypothesis, by Doederlein and others.

Flügge, *Die Weissagungen welche bey den Schriften des Propheten Sacharjas beygebogen sind*, 1784.

He divides chs. 9–14 into nine distinct prophecies, as follows: 9; $10^{1\,f.}$; 10^{3-12}; 11^{1-3}; 11^{4-17}; 12^{1-9}; 12^{10}–13^{6}; 13^{7-9}; 14; to which he assigns various dates. He explains their appearance in the book of Zechariah by supposing that they were preserved by this prophet, or given their present place in the collection to which his book belongs by some one else before Malachi was added. His reasons for separating them from chs. 1–8, as compiled by Burger (119), are: the testimony of Matthew; the absence of dates; the space between chs. 8 and 9 in Kenn. 195; a difference of style; the absence of allusions to the former prophets; the absence of symbolism, except in ch. 11; the absence of angels, except in 12^{8}; the appearance of parallelism; a difference in content; the rivalry between the two kingdoms; the unsuitableness of heralding a king under Persian rule; the absence of a motive for predicting evil to Tyre, Sidon, etc.

Later it was somewhat modified by Bertholdt,* who attributes chs. 9–11 to Zechariah, the son of Jeberechiah, a contemporary of Isaiah (Is. 8^{2}), and 12–14 to an author of the period just before the fall of the Judean monarchy; and from his time onward it has had more defenders than that which attributes chs. 9–14 to a single author. Among those who have adopted it are Gesenius,† Maurer, Hitzig, Ewald,‡ Bleek,§ v. Ortenberg,** Davidson,†† Reuss, Bruston,‡‡ Orelli, König,§§ and Grützmacher.*** The arguments in support of it are largely drawn from statements and allusions that are supposed to point to the dates above mentioned, or others previous to the Exile. The question now is whether the inferences drawn from the given data are correct.

First, it is claimed that the appearance of the names Hadrak, Damascus and the principal cities of Phœnicia and Philistia in 9^{1-10} implies that the peoples inhabiting them were autonomous, and that, since they were subdued by Tiglath-pileser III, and thenceforward formed parts of the Assyrian, Babylonian or Persian empire, this prophecy antedates 734 B.C. Indeed, Ewald and

* *Einl.*[4], 1697 *ff.*
† *Isaiah*, 327.
‡ *Proph.*, i, 248 *ff.*, ii, 52 *f.*
§ *Einl.*[4], 440 *ff.*
** *Bestandtheile des Buches Sacharja*, 68 *ff.*
†† *Introd.*, iii, 329 *ff.*
‡‡ *Histoire de la Littérature Prophétique*, 116 *ff.*
§§ *Einl.*, 366 *ff.*
*** *Untersuchungen*, 45 *ff.*

others, including Grützmacher, regard it as a prediction of the invasion of Palestine by the Assyrian king in that year. This, at first sight, seems a plausible suggestion, but it will not bear examination.

In the first place, as is proven by the woes pronounced against some of the cities here mentioned in Je. 47 and elsewhere, the little states in and about Palestine were not lost in the shadows of the great powers on which they were dependent, but, so long as they were of any importance, remained individual objects of interest to the Hebrew prophets. (The clause "before Pharaoh smote Gaza" in v. ^{1} is a gloss. Giesebrecht.) If, therefore, Zc. 9^{1-10}, was written by a contemporary of Isaiah, the proof to that effect must be sought elsewhere than in the mere mention of the threatened cities. The truth is that it cannot be found, but that such evidence as there is points to a later origin. Note, for example, that, while Ephraim is mentioned in v. ^{10}, the Hebrew capital is Sion, that is, Jerusalem; in other words, that the author cherishes a prospect of reunion among the twelve tribes for which there was no warrant until the northern kingdom had been overthrown. Again, observe that the king described in vv. $^{9\,f.}$ is not the conquering hero of Is. $9^{1/2\,ff.}$, but a composite character with a decided resemblance to the Servant of Yahweh of Is. 40 *ff.* Finally, there is unmistakable evidence of development in the fact that, while Amos predicts the destruction of Damascus and the rest, the author of this passage expects some, at least, of the Philistines to be spared and incorporated into the new Hebrew commonwealth.

A second point on which stress is laid by the defenders of a comparatively early date, at least for chs. 9–11, is that in 10^{10} Egypt and Assyria represent the remotest regions to which the Hebrews have been scattered, and in v. ^{11} these countries are threatened; from which facts it is argued that ch. 10 must have been written before the end of the seventh century B.C., when the Assyrian empire was overthrown. This, if the other indications pointed in the same direction, would be a legitimate conclusion; but when the usage of the Old Testament with reference to the name Assyria is examined, it becomes very doubtful, the fact being that, as will appear later, "Assyria" is actually employed to designate, not only the empire properly so called, but Babylonia, Persia and even Syria.

Thus far attention has been given only to allusions in chs. 9–14 to contemporary peoples. There are others to internal conditions as they existed when these chapters were written. The references to Ephraim, as distinguished from Judah, have been considered

significant. One, that in 9^{10}, has already been cited. The others are in 9^{13} 10^{6} (Joseph) 10^{7} 11^{14} (Israel).* In the case of 9^{10} it was found that Ephraim and Judah (Jerusalem) were not two independent states existing when the passage was written, but components of the Messianic kingdom of the future, and this, in view of the fact that the references to Ephraim or Joseph are connected with a promise of restoration from exile, is the interpretation that must be given to 9^{13} and $10^{6\,f.}$.† Moreover, those who refer $11^{4\,ff.}$ to the same author as 9^{11}–11^{3} will have to admit that the "brotherhood between Judah and Israel" of 11^{14} is a bond of the restored community.

The passages in which mention is made of idols and false prophets, also, are cited as proof of the pre-exilic origin of the prophecies in which they occur. Those who thus use them, assuming that the Hebrews were cured of their tendency to disloyalty to Yahweh by the Exile, claim that 10^{2} reflects the same state of things as Hosea's prophecies, and $13^{2\,ff.}$ that of the time of Jeremiah.

There are several things to be said in reply. In the first place, it is incorrect to allege that the Hebrews were free from idolatry after the Restoration, or secure from the mischievous teaching of unauthorised prophets. The hostility of Ezra and Nehemiah to marriages with foreign women and the measures they took to prevent or undo them can only be explained by supposing, not only that these marriages exposed the husbands to temptation (Ne. $13^{23\,ff.}$), but that they sometimes resulted in apostasy from Yahweh. As to false prophets, Nehemiah testifies that one of them, in the service of his enemies, attempted to turn him from his great work. See Ne. $6^{10\,ff.}$; also v. [7], where Sanballat accuses Nehemiah of having some in his employ. If, therefore, 10^{2}, of which only the first two clauses and the last two are original, had reference to the time of the author, the mention therein of teraphim and diviners would not determine his date. It is clear, however, from the latter part of the verse that the writer is thinking of the past, and that between him and the period to which these things belong a dynasty has been overthrown and a people scattered. It is not so easy to identify the dynasty or the people. At first sight v. [3] seems to furnish a key to the difficulty, but since the phrase "the house of Judah" is undoubtedly a gloss, it settles nothing. From v. [6], however, it appears that the flock of Yahweh includes both Ephraim and Judah, and that therefore the author of v. [3] in its original form must have written after both of these kingdoms had been overthrown. *Cf.* Ho. 3^{5}, a gloss of the same period.

* In 9^{1} Israel evidently includes Judah, while in 12^{1} it seems to have practically the same meaning.

† In 10^{3} "the house of Judah" is a gloss.

Some of those who refer chs. 9–11 to the eighth century B.C. find in 11^8 a confirmation of their opinion, claiming that the three shepherds of that passage are three kings who came to the throne of Israel during the troubled period that succeeded the death of Jeroboam II. If they refer chs. 12–14 to the same period, 12^{11} may be cited against them; for, as will be shown, the most natural interpretation of that passage is that which makes it an allusion to the universal grief caused by the untimely death of the good king Josiah at the battle of Megiddo. In either case it is a valid objection that no one has ever yet been able to name three kings of Israel "destroyed," as the text requires them to have been, within the space of a single month. Finally, it must be taken into account that, as will be shown, the first clause of 11^8 is a gloss and therefore may not represent the stand-point of the original author.

A reference to the earthquake in the reign of Uzziah, such as is found in 14^5, might, of course, have been made at any time after the death of this king, but, since no one thinks of separating ch. 12 from 14, it is plain that this one cannot be earlier than that to the death of Josiah in 12^{11}. In point of fact, it is later, being, like the reference to the three shepherds in 11^8, an interpolation.

Those who adopt a pre-exilic date or dates for chs. 9–14 generally base their opinion on the historical background as they mistakenly conceive it. Grützmacher, however, dwells at some length on the ideas most prominent in this part of the book of Zechariah, claiming that they, too, support this position.

Thus, he says (34) that "the representation of the Messiah contained in Zc. $9^{9\,ff.}$ fits only the period before the Exile, and is inexplicable if assigned to a postexilic date." With reference to the conversion of the Gentiles he says (36), "The views expressed in ch. 14 do not suggest a postexilic author, but find their natural explanation in the assumption that this prophecy originated before the Exile." Both of these points were anticipated in the discussion of 9^{1-10} and the places there enumerated. It is only necessary in this connection to call attention to the irrelevancy of Grützmacher's arguments in support of them. He says (33) that the idea of the Messiah found in 9^{9-11} (more correctly, $9^{9\,f.}$) "witnesses against the postexilic origin of Zc. 9–14, because we nowhere find a view similar to that here expressed, except in Is. $9^{5/6\,ff.}$ and $11^{1\,ff.}$, and Mi. $5^{1\,ff.}$ and 2^{13}." The assumption that the Messiah of $9^{9\,f.}$ is the same as, or similar to, the one in the passages cited from Isaiah and Micah is, as has already been shown, mistaken. Hence, the conclusion based on it is without foundation.

The contention that the attitude of the author of chs. 12–14 toward the Gentiles favours the opinion that he wrote before the Exile is equally baseless. It is not enough to show, as Grützmacher undertakes to do, that the idea of the participation of the heathen in the ideal kingdom of the future is found in Jeremiah and Second Isaiah. The question is, whether it is found there in the same, or nearly the same, stage of development as in the last chapters of Zechariah. The fact that in 9^{7}, which Grützmacher overlooks, the stand-point of the author is more advanced than that of any known pre-exilic or exilic writer shows that even this passage is of postexilic origin. If, therefore, as Grützmacher maintains, chs. 12–14 are later than 9–11, how can chs. 12–14 have been written in the time of Jeremiah?

It remains to consider the relation of the author, or authors, of chs. 9–14 to the other prophets.

Those who refer these chapters to the period before the Exile, not being agreed on a precise date or dates, naturally differ also on this question. Thus, v. Ortenberg (71), who thinks that 9^{1-10} antedates Amos, cannot but regard Am. $1^{3\,ff.}$ as an imitation of that passage. Grützmacher, on the other hand, says (25), "It is very probable that the author of Zc. 9 *ff.* had the prophecies of Amos before him and used them." The latter is no doubt correct, but he does not tell the whole story, for the influence of Amos does not account for all the familiar features of 9^{1-10}. There is the term "hope" or "expectation," in the sense of an object of confidence or reliance, in v. ^{5}, a term used elsewhere only in Is. 20^{5}. More striking still is the parallelism between vv. $^{3\,f.}$ and Ez. $28^{3\,f.\,8}$, where the wisdom and wealth of Tyre are described and its fate decreed. Finally, as has twice already been noted, the picture of the Messiah in v. ^{9} is a composite one, as if the spirit of the Servant of Yahweh were stamped on the features of Isaiah's Ideal King. *Cf.* Is. $9^{6/7\,f.}$ 49^{6} $50^{7\,ff.}$. Now, in the first of these three cases, if it were the only one, the direction of the dependence would be difficult to determine; but in the last two it seems clear that the author of Zc. 9^{1-10} is the debtor, it being more reasonable to suppose that in vv. $^{3\,f.}$ he borrowed the substance of his brief oracle from Ezekiel than that Ezekiel expanded those two verses into a chapter, and that in vv. $^{9\,f.}$ he combined two familiar ideals than that the Great Unknown of the Exile dissected his composite character for the materials from which the Servant of Yahweh was developed. The inference is obvious. If the author of 9^{1-10}, which is generally recognised as the oldest section of the second part of Zechariah, borrowed from Ezekiel and the Second Isaiah, neither he nor the author of any subsequent section can have written before the Exile.

Two points have now been established: first, that chs. 9–14 were not written by Zechariah, and second, that they were not written

before or during the Exile. They must, therefore, have originated after the Exile. It remains to determine to what part or parts of the latter period they belong.

The first question naturally is whether they may not have come from one or more of Zechariah's contemporaries. This is not probable. One reason for doubting it is the fact that they are attached to the genuine prophecies of Zechariah, the example of the book of Isaiah strongly favouring the presumption that such additions are later, and usually considerably later, than the original work. See also Amos and Jeremiah. A second reason is found in the fact that when Zechariah first began to prophesy the hopes of the Jews were centred on the actual governor, Zerubbabel, and after his removal they seem for a time to have abandoned their Messianic expectations.

The first to propose to assign chs. 9–14 to a date or dates later than that of Zechariah was not, as Robinson (11) tells his readers, Grotius, who in his commentary repeatedly attributes them to Zechariah,* but Corrodi, who, in 1792,† as v. Ortenberg puts it, "took refuge in the desperate assumption that ch. 9 was written in the time of Alexander, ch. 14 in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes." A similar view was finally adopted by Eichhorn in 1824,‡ and later by others, the most important being Vatke,§ Geiger** and Böttcher.†† For some years after the publication of Böttcher's work the view held by the above-mentioned scholars found no new defenders, but in 1881 Stade‡‡ undertook an exhaustive study of the subject, reaching the conclusion that chs. 9–14 are the work of one author, who wrote "during the second half of the period of the wars of the Diadochi," or between 306 and 278 B.C. The influence of Stade soon began to show itself. In the first place he kindled a fresh interest and discussion concerning his Deutero-Zechariah, and secondly, he compelled a new alignment among those who have since written on the subject. Most

* Thus, on 9^{12}, he adds to the statement "I declare" "by Zechariah," and on 11^{1}, to "my God" ' *i. e.*, Zechariah's," etc. He insists, however, that 9^{8} is a prediction of the invasion of Palestine by Alexander the Great, and that other passages have reference to much later events.

† *Versuch einer Beleuchtung der Geschichte des jüd. u. christl. Bibelkanons*, i, 107.

‡ *Einl.*[4], iv, 427 *ff.*, 444 *ff.*

§ *Biblische Theologie*, 1834, i, 553.

** *Urschrift u. Uebersetzung*, 1857, 55 *f.*, 73 *f.*

†† *Aehrenlese*, 1863–64, ii, 215 *f.*

‡‡ *ZAW.*, 1881, 1 *ff.*; 1882, 151 *ff.*, 275 *ff.*

of them agree in referring the chapters in question to a period after Zechariah. Even Kuenen,* who clings to the pre-exilic origin of "fragments" in 9–11 and 13^{7-9}, admits that these remains of the eighth century B.C. "have been arranged and enriched with additions from his own hand by a post-exilic redactor." See also Staerk† and Eckardt.‡ The following agree with Stade in maintaining the unity as well as the post-Zecharian date of chs. 9–14: Wildeboer,§ Wellhausen,** Marti, Kuiper,†† and Cornill.‡‡ These find in them traces of plural authorship during the same period; Driver,§§ Nowack and Rubinkam.*** Of recent writers who have resisted this general drift the most important are Grützmacher, who, as has been explained, contends for a dual authorship before the Exile, and Robinson††† and van Hoonacker, who adhere to the traditional opinion that the whole of the book was written by the prophet whose name it bears.

It is not necessary to dwell on the variations from the conclusions of Stade represented by the authors cited as agreeing with him in assigning chs. 9–14 to a period later than Zechariah. A better method will be to treat the question of date and authorship positively in the light of the discussion that has been aroused, but on the basis of the data which the chapters themselves supply. In so doing it is important, if possible, first to fix the date of 9^{1-10}. This is a distinct prophecy, as is shown (1) by its poetical form, a succession of twenty-four three-toned lines divided into four double tristichs. The tristich gives place to the tetrastich in v. [11], where (2) the language also indicates the commencement of a new prophecy. This second point may have further significance. It may mean that v. [11] not only begins a new section, but introduces a new author, in other words, that the author of $9^{11\,ff.}$ has here preserved an earlier utterance of another prophet and made it a sort of text for his own predictions. This suggestion is favoured by the fact that some of the features of vv. [1-10] are entirely ignored in the

* *Onderzoek*, ii, 411.
† *Untersuchungen*, 72, 100.
‡ *ZAW.*, 1893, 102, 109.
§ *Letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds*, 1896, 417.
** *Die kleinen Propheten*, 1892; ed. 3, 1898.
†† *Zacharia ix–xiv*, 1894, 163.
‡‡ *Einl.*[5], 1905.†
§§ *Introd.*[5], 348 *ff.*
*** *The Second Part of the Book of Zechariah*, 1892, 83 *f.*
††† *The Prophecies of Zechariah*, 1896.

following context, and, indeed, throughout the remainder of the book; for example, the coming king and the salvation of the heathen. The possibility that these verses form an independent prophecy frees one from the necessity of seeking a date for them, as Stade must, between 306 and 278 B.C., and permits one to reopen the whole subject, inquiring first, not what historical event corresponds to this prediction, but what circumstances would naturally furnish an occasion for it. There can be no doubt that oppression would create a desire for deliverance, but the oppressed would hardly dare comfort one another with promises of relief, unless there was a possible deliverer in sight. If, however, there can be found a time in the history of the Jews after the Restoration when these conditions were fulfilled, the fact that they were then fulfilled will speak strongly for that time as the date of this prophecy. Now, a serious objection to the dates, 301, 295 and 280, to which Stade restricts himself is that, although in each case there was a movement against Palestine from the north by Seleucus I, or Antiochus I his son, in neither case was the movement formidable or the Jews in a condition to welcome it. They always preferred the sovereignty of Egypt to that of Syria until, after a century, the Ptolemies forgot the wisdom and tolerance that had previously characterised the dynasty* and lent themselves to schemes for plundering their dependent neighbours. It is more probable that such a prophecy as this would be written before or after, than during, the period in question; for before it, when, in 333 B.C., Alexander, having defeated Darius III at Issus, moved southward, and after it, when, in 220, Antiochus III returned from the East flushed with victory and resumed his attempt to get possession of Palestine, the Jews were ready for a change and really had a prospect of deliverance.† The former of these dates seems favoured by the description of Tyre (v. [3]), from which one would infer that, when it was written, the city had never been taken, as it had not been when Alexander at-

* Mahaffy explains this attitude as the result of (1) the comparative humanity of the Egyptians when they occupied Palestine, and (2) the policy of the Ptolemies in accordance with which they planted Jewish colonies in Egypt instead of Egyptian colonies in Palestine. *Egypt under the Ptolemies*, 88 *f*.

† Of the latter Polybius (xv, 37) says: "King Antiochus, at the beginning of his reign, was thought to be a man of great enterprise and courage and great vigour."

tacked it. There is another indication pointing in the same direction. It is found in v. [8]. This verse, as will be shown, is an interpolation, and, as such, has not the same value as it would have if it were a part of the original text; but it has a value as an indication how the earliest Jewish readers understood the prophecy. The one who inserted it was doubtless familiar with the story that, when Alexander was on his way to Egypt, he not only spared the Jews, but treated them with great consideration, and he naïvely added what seemed to him a neglected detail to bring prophecy and fulfilment into more perfect harmony.

Josephus says (*Ant.*, x, 8, 4) that Alexander, after taking Gaza, made a visit to Jerusalem, where, having been received by a great procession, "he offered sacrifices to God according to the high priest's direction" and bestowed upon the Jews certain important privileges, at the same time promising any who would enlist in his army that "they should continue in the laws of their fathers and live according to them"; and there is nothing incredible in the story in this its unembellished version.

These considerations make it probable that Kuiper is correct in concluding that 9^{1-10} in its original form was written in 333 B.C., just after the battle of Issus.*

The prophecy in 9^{1-10}, as preserved, is a part of a larger whole, namely, 9–11 and 13^{7-9}, which is bound together by a common recognition of Ephraim as co-heir with Judah to the good things of the future. The other two parts, however, as can be shown, belong to a later stage in the Greek period. The passage on which an argument for such a date would naturally be based is 9^{13}, where the enemies over whom the sons of Sion are promised victory are called "sons of Greece." If this passage could be taken at its face value, the case would be a clear one, for evidently the author, whoever he was, could not refer to the Greeks until they came within the Jewish horizon, and would not refer to them as enemies until his people had suffered at their hands. The matter, however, is not so simple. The truth is that, as any one with an ear for rhythm,

* The oppressor to whom allusion is made in v. [8] would thus be Artaxerxes III (359–338 B.C.), who, within a few years, on the occasion of a revolt in which the Jews were implicated, had invaded and devastated the country and carried many of its inhabitants into captivity to Hyrcania.

on reading the passage in the original, will perceive, the words "thy sons, O Greece" are another gloss; that, therefore, they may not represent the mind of the original author. This fact makes it necessary, as in the case of 9^{1-10}, to examine the original text and determine, if possible, at what date in the Greek period the conditions described or implied existed. This at first sight seems not very difficult. It is at once (9^{11}) evident that many of Sion's children are captives in other lands. Later (10^{10}) it appears that they are not all in the far East, but that some of them have been carried to Egypt. At the same time one learns that their case is not hopeless, that they expect to be restored to their country, and, indeed, to some extent by their own efforts. In other words, one sees a national spirit asserting itself. From 11^{4} onward, however, there is a greatly changed tone. Hope is not, it is true, entirely quenched, but it is a "hope deferred," and there is mingled with it a bitterness, the effect of positive oppression, of which there is no trace in 9^{11}–11^{3}. These conflicting indications cannot be reconciled. They can only be explained by supposing that $11^{4\,ff.}$ and 13^{7-9} were written at a different time, or, at any rate, by a different author, from 9^{11}–11^{3}.

This inference is strengthened on a closer examination of the first two of these sections. The most striking peculiarities in their diction are the substitution of prose for poetry and the employment of the first person as if in imitation of Zechariah. There is another reminder of that prophet in the expression (v. [4]), "Thus said Yahweh," the original of which is the same as that of the "Thus saith Yahweh" of the first eight chapters. Note also that in 11^{14} "Israel" takes the place of the "Ephraim" of 9^{13} and 10^{7} and "the house of Joseph" of 10^{6}; and that in 11^{6} the verb "rescue" (נצל, Hiph.) is used instead of the "save" (ישע, Hiph.) of 9^{9} and 10^{6}, while in 11^{13} the word for "glory" is different from the one in v. [3] (ארר instead of אררת). Finally, there are certain rare words, forms and meanings that confirm the impression already made: מצא, Hiph., *surrender*, 11^{6}; כתת, Pi., *crush*, 11^{6}; נעם, *delight*, 11^{7}; מקל, *staff*, $11^{7\,ff.}$; בחל. *loathe*, 11^{8}; שמר, *watch*, 11^{11}; יקר, *price*, 11^{13}; נצב, Ni., *survive*, 11^{16}; עזב, with י ָ *compaginis*, 11^{17}; גבר עמיתי, *my companion*, 13^{7}.

The evidence seems conclusive: 9^{11}–11^{3} and 11^{4-17} with 13^{7-9} come from different authors. The next step is to inquire whether in the Greek period there are to be found corresponding conditions. The history of this period, so far as the relations of Palestine to the neighbouring countries is concerned, is briefly as follows: Alex-

ander, as has already been observed, was friendly to the Jews. After his death Seleucus and Ptolemy vied with each other to secure their goodwill and allegiance. In the struggle between the two the Jews naturally suffered severely from both parties, but they always preferred Egyptian to Syrian supremacy. The reason is obvious. Josephus says* that, although Ptolemy took Jerusalem by guile and carried many of the inhabitants of the country into captivity, he treated them so well that "not a few other Jews went into Egypt of their own accord, attracted by the goodness of the soil and the liberality of Ptolemy." This king cannot, however, have given them all "equal privileges as citizens with the Macedonians," if the historian is correct in saying, as he does in another place,† that many of them did not receive their freedom until the reign of Ptolemy II (Philadelphus, 285–247 B.C.). The latter further commended himself to the Jews by taking an interest in their Scriptures, the first part of which, the Law of Moses, is said to have been translated into Greek under his patronage.

The earliest extant account of this translation is found in the famous pseudograph called *The Letter of Aristeas*, the text of which is published in an Appendix to Swete's *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. For Josephus's version of the story, see *Ant.*, xii, 2; for an estimate of its historical value, Buhl, *Kanon u. Text des A. T.*, 111 *ff*.

Ptolemy III (Euergetes, 247–222 B.C.) at first seems to have followed the example of his predecessors,‡ but he finally adopted or permitted a different policy. At any rate, in his reign the taxes paid by the Jews, which had not hitherto been burdensome, were greatly increased and the collection of them put into the hands of an unscrupulous adventurer, Joseph, son of Tobias, who enjoyed the profits of the office for twenty-two years. *Cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, xii, 4, 1 *ff*.

The account of Joseph given by Josephus is chronologically contradictory. The reigning king of Egypt is first identified with the one (Ptolemy V) to whom Antiochus III gave his daughter Cleopatra, and a little later called Ptolemy Euergetes (III). It is the latter, as Wellhausen (*IJG.*) has shown, who was ruling at the time. In the reign of Ptolemy V Palestine was annexed to the Syrian empire, and, of course, paid tribute to Antiochus III.

* *Ant.*, xii, 2, 1. † *Ant.*, xii, 2, 3. ‡ Josephus, *Cont. Apion*, ii, 5.

Meanwhile a fourth Ptolemy (Philopator, 222–205 B.C.) had come to the throne of Egypt. Polybius says of this king that "he would attend to no business," being "absorbed in unworthy intrigues and senseless and continual drunkenness." The Jews also give him a bad character. The third book of Maccabees is entirely devoted to an account of him and his relations with his Jewish subjects. It says that after the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) he went to Jerusalem, entered the temple and attempted to invade the Holy of Holies. Being providentially prevented, on his return to Egypt he undertook "to inflict a disgrace upon the Jewish nation." He therefore ordered "that those who did not sacrifice [according to his directions] should not enter their temples; that all the Jews should be degraded to the lowest rank and to the condition of slaves,"* etc.; and, when most of the Jews refused to obey his mandate, he made proclamation that they should "be conveyed, with insults and harsh treatment, secured in every way by iron bands, to undergo an inevitable and ignominious death."† The details of this marvellous story are evidently in large measure fictitious, but its origin and currency among the Jews cannot be explained except on the supposition "that Philopator earned the hostility of that people and that they looked back upon his reign as one of oppression and injustice."‡

The above sketch does scant justice even to Jewish interests in the Greek period. It is sufficient, however, for the present purpose. It shows that the Jews, fostered and encouraged, first by Alexander, and then by the Ptolemies, finally, under Philadelphus, began to feel their importance and demand larger concessions. This is precisely the situation to give rise to dreams of a new Exodus and a revival of the glory of the Jewish race like those of 9^{11}–11^{3}. It also explains the "liberality" of Philadelphus, who never attempted by force anything that he could accomplish by diplomacy. His successors, as has been shown, adopted a different policy, thus creating a situation which would naturally give rise to such utterances as are found in 11^{4-17} and 13^{7-9}.

There is one possible objection to the second of the above iden-

* 3 Mac. $2^{27 ff.}$.

† 3 Mac. 3^{25}.

‡ Mahaffy, *Egypt under the Ptolemies*, 270; *History of Egypt*, iv, 145.

tifications. It is found in the oft-cited statement concerning the three shepherds in 11⁸. Not that this can refer to any trio of kings or pretendants in the history of the kingdom of Israel. If it is by the same hand as the context, it is still without doubt later than Zechariah. If, however, as seems the case, it is a gloss, it may have been suggested by Dn. 11²⁰, the three kings being Antiochus the Great, Seleucus IV and the usurper Heliodorus. For details, see the comments. The question would then be, whether the glossator was correct, in other words, to which of two situations 11^{4-17} and 13^{7-9} more nearly correspond, the one above outlined or the somewhat later one (220 B.C.) created by the interference of Antiochus the Great and his success in finally securing possession of Palestine. The prominence of "the traders," apparently tax-collectors, favours the former alternative.

The defenders of the pre-exilic origin of chs. 9–14, as has been explained, have usually felt themselves compelled to accept the theory of plural authorship. On the other hand, those who refer them to the postexilic period, being relieved from any such necessity, incline with Stade to attribute the whole, or at least all but 9^{1-10}, to a single author. So We., Marti, Eckardt, GASm., Cor. and others. There is room, however, from their stand-point for a different opinion. It is true, as Stade has observed (*ZAW*., 1881, 86), that there is a correspondence between chs. 9–11, with 13^{7-9}, and chs. 12–14, without 13^{7-9}, but it is a correspondence with a difference, and the difference is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the latter division was written by an author different from either of those who produced the former. There is not so much difference in language, because all three belong to the same school and draw largely on the same resources, especially Ezekiel. For a list of common words and expressions, see Eckardt, *ZAW*., 1893, 100 *f*. There are, however, some peculiarities: אדרת *mantle*, 13^{4}; in 11^{3}, *glory*, for which 12^{7} has תפראת; גנן, *protect*, with בעד, 12^{8} but with על 9^{15}; ישב, *dwell*, of Jerusalem, 12^{6} $14^{10.\ 11}$; ישב(י) ירושלם, *inhabitant(s) of Jerusalem*, $12^{5.\ 7.\ 8.\ 10}$ 13^{1}; כמו, *as*, 9^{15} $10^{2.\ 7.\ 8}$, not in chs. 12–14; ציון, *Sion*, $9^{9.\ 13}$, not in chs. 12–14; אסף, *gather*, 12^{3} $14^{2.\ 14}$, but קבץ, $10^{8.\ 10}$.

More significant is the difference in literary form,—the halting, uncertain measure, when there is any attempt at rhythm, compared with the regularity in 9^{11}–11^{3},—which makes the hypothesis that the same person may have written both divisions at different stages in his life ridiculous.

These are merely formal distinctions. There is also a difference of content. In the first place, it is noticeable that in chs. 12–14

(without 13^{7-9}) the writer, as in the genuine prophecies of Zechariah, confines his attention to Judah, the northern tribes, never overlooked in chs. 9–11, being entirely ignored. Indeed, as if he were afraid of being misunderstood, he gives (14^{10}) the dimensions of the Holy Land of the future with Jerusalem as its centre. The repeated references to David or the house of David, too, are worthy of notice. Compare the silence of the author of 9^{11}–11^{3}, after having reproduced $9^{10\,f.}$, with reference to the royal family. At the same time pains is here taken to remind the reader of the claims of the house of Levi. Nor is this the only indication of the sympathy of the writer with the priests and their interests. His last thought is of the temple crowded with worshippers of all nations. It is not impossible that sacerdotal jealousy prompted 13^{2-6}. Be that as it may, this interesting passage can hardly be by the same author as $11^{4\,ff.}$, which is anything but hostile to the prophetic order. Finally, the last division of chs. 9–14 is distinguished, not only from 1–8, but from 9–11 and 13^{7-9} by an apocalyptic tone and teaching the characteristics of which have already been discussed. See pp. 239 *f.*

It is clear that, if the relation between the main divisions of chs. 9–14 has been correctly defined, 12–14 (exc. 13^{7-9}) must be later than 9^{11}–11^{3} and 13^{7-9}. How much later it is there seems to be no means of learning. The general impression one gets from reading it, and especially the similarity of the situation implied in $14^{1\,ff.}$ to that in $13^{8\,f.}$, indicates that the interval was not a long one. Indeed, it is possible that these prophecies should be explained as the differing views of unlike persons on the same situation, namely, that in the interval between the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) and the death of Ptolemy IV (204 B.C.), when Antiochus the Great was waiting for an opportunity to renew his attempt on Palestine.

The following, then, is the result of the discussion of the date and authorship of chs. 9–14. The introductory verses (9^{1-10}) are a distinct prophecy written soon after the battle of Issus (333 B.C.). This was made the text for a more extended utterance (9^{11}–11^{3}) which dates from the reign of Ptolemy III (247–222 B.C.). A third writer, soon after the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.), supplemented this

combined work by a pessimistic picture (11^{4-17} with 13^{7-9}) of the situation as he saw it. About the same time a fourth with apocalyptic tendencies undertook to present the whole subject in a more optimistic light, the result being 12^{1}–13^{6} and 14. It is possible that 9^{1-10} was originally an appendix to chs. 1–8, and that the rest were added in their order. Since, however, there is no clear reference in any of them to chs. 1–8, it seems safer to suppose that no part of the last six chapters was added to the book of Zechariah until they had all been written.

COMMENTARY ON CHAPTERS 9–14

OF THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH.

The last six chapters of the book called after Zechariah naturally fall into two divisions, separated by the title at the beginning of ch. 12, or more exactly, as has already been explained, consisting of chs. 9–11, with the addition of 13^{7-9} and chs. 12–14 without the verses specified. The general subject of the first division is

1. *The revival of the Hebrew nation* (9^{1}–11^{17} 13^{7-9}).

This division contains three sections, the contents of which come from as many authors, writing at different dates and representing more or less divergent lines of thought and expectation. The first deals with

a. THE NEW KINGDOM (9^{1-10}).

This section must be viewed from two stand-points. Originally, as has been explained, it was probably a separate prophecy, written soon after the battle of Issus by some one who saw in Alexander the divinely appointed and directed instrument for the deliverance of his people and the restoration of the Hebrew state. The author who gave it its present setting meant that it should be taken differently, viewed as a picture, not of the time of Alexander, but of a period still future when the highest hopes of his people would be realised. Two thoughts may be distinguished, the first being

(1) *The recovery of the Promised Land* (9^{1-8}).—When the Hebrews invaded Palestine they were not able to obtain possession of the whole country. Nor did their kings, the greatest of them, succeed in bringing it entirely under their dominion. They believed, however, that the conquest would one day be completed. This proph-

ecy is a picture of the final occupation of those parts of the country that the Hebrews had not been able to subjugate. The general movement is from north to south, that is, from "the River" Euphrates toward "the ends of the earth" (v. ^{10}); but the writer does not follow the precise order in which the points mentioned would naturally be reached by an invader traversing the country in that direction. Thus, Damascus precedes Hamath, and the cities of Philistia follow one another apparently without reference to their relative location. Compare Isaiah's spirited sketch of the advance of the Assyrians in $10^{27 \text{ ff.}}$. The paragraph closes with a promise not in the original prophecy, that Yahweh will protect his people in the enjoyment of their increased possessions.

1. The prophecy begins with a word, משׂא, literally meaning *something uplifted*, and hence, not only *burden* (Ex. 23^{5}), but, since the Hebrews "uplifted" their voices in speaking, *utterance, oracle*. *Cf.* 2 K. 9^{25}.* Jeremiah, in 23^{33}, taking advantage of this ambiguity, produced one of the best examples of paronomasia in the Old Testament.† Here it must be rendered *oracle* and, since it is not used absolutely, connected with the following phrase, thus producing at the same time a title, *An oracle of the word of Yahweh*, and the first line of the first tristich. This title being required for the completion of the tristich, must always have been connected with the following context, but it originally covered only vv. $^{1-10}$. The editor or compiler who inserted the corresponding title in 12^{1} seems to have intended that this one should cover the intervening chapters. *Cf.* Mal. 1^{1}. If the title constitutes a line, the words *in the land of Hadrak* must be another, or the remains of one. The latter is the more defensible alternative, since, although the author evidently intended that this clause and the one following should correspond, they are now but imperfectly parallel. The need of another word is apparent, but it is not so clear what should be sup-

* Wrongly rendered in the English version, "the LORD laid this burden upon him," the correct translation being, "Yahweh uttered this oracle against him."

† The figure is greatly obscured by a curious error in 𝔐, the words in one place having been wrongly divided by a careless copyist. For את מה משׂא, "What burden?" read אתם המשׂא and translate the whole verse, "When this people, or a prophet, or a priest asketh, saying, What is the *maśśa'* (*oracle*) of Yahweh? thou shalt say to them, Ye are the *maśśa'* (*burden*), and I will cast you off."

plied. The answer to this question depends on the interpretation given to the next clause, whether it is Yahweh or his word whose *resting-place* is to be in Damascus. Stade and others adopt the former view and, in accordance with it, supply *Yahweh*, but this can hardly have been the thought of the prophet. To say that Yahweh was about to seek a place of rest in Syria would denote peculiar favour, whereas, as the next verses abundantly show, the message of the prophet as a whole menaces violence and destruction for the time being to the surrounding peoples. It must therefore be the word of Yahweh that is the subject in both of these clauses, his decree, or, still more precisely, the evil decreed. The missing word was perhaps the one used in a precisely similar case by Isaiah in $9^{7/8}$, the whole clause reading, *in the land of Hadrak shall it fall*. The land of Hadrak is not elsewhere mentioned in the Old Testament, but there can be no doubt about its relative location, for from the next verse it appears that it bordered upon Hamath. This being the case, Schrader is probably correct in identifying it with Ḥattarik(k)a, a city and country several times mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions, which Delitzsch, on the basis of these references, locates "a little north of Lebanon."* The country so called must have been one of considerable extent and importance; otherwise the Assyrians would not have had to make three expeditions against it between 772 and 755 B.C. to subdue it and hold it in subjection.† Hence it is not strange to find it here representing the northern part of the Promised Land. In this land of Hadrak the word of Yahweh will begin its destructive work, but *Damascus* also *shall be its resting-place*, one of the places on which the divine displeasure will fall. This interpretation harmonises not only with the context, but with the constant attitude of the Hebrews toward the kingdom of Syria, which was always one of hostility. *Cf.* Am. 1^{3} Is. $17^{1 ff.}$, etc. No Jew of the time of the author would have entertained the idea that Yahweh would find a resting-place at Damascus.

* *Cf.* *KAT.*³, 482 *ff.*; Dl.Par., 278 f.; also *KAT.*³, map. We. identifies it with the region of Antioch the capital of the Syrian empire. Pognon finds the city of *Hadrak* mentioned under the Aram. name *Hasrak* in a proclamation by one Zakir, a king of Hamath. *RB.*, 1907, 555 *ff.*

† *Cf.* *KAT.*³, 482 *ff.*

It seems strange that any of the later Jews should have adopted this opinion; yet it is found in 𝔗 and some later authorities. A quotation from one of these shows how they contrived to defend it. A rabbi says: "I take heaven and earth to witness that I am from Damascus, and that there is there a place called Hadrak. But how do I justify the words, *and Damascus shall be his resting-place?* Jerusalem will one day extend to Damascus; for it says, *and Damascus shall be his resting-place*, and his *resting-place*, according to the Scripture, *this is my rest forever*, is none other than Jerusalem." R. Jose in *Yalkut Shimeoni*, i, fol. 258.

The line just quoted closes the first tristich. The next clause, in its original form, carries the same idea forward to a second and connected one; for this clause should read, not, as in the Massoretic text, *toward Yahweh is the eye of man*, which is meaningless in this connection, but, as Klostermann has acutely conjectured, *to Yahweh are the cities of Aram*, that is, Syria. These cities are his in the sense that they lie within the limits of the territory that he has promised to his people. *Cf.* v. [10] Gn. 15^{18}, etc. The claim of Yahweh to Damascus and the rest of the cities of Syria was expressly set forth because it had been, and still was, contested. There was no such reason for asserting his right to the territory actually occupied by the Hebrews, but some one, mistaking the original author's purpose, for the sake of completeness and in defiance of metrical considerations, has added *and*, or, more freely rendered, *as well as*, *all the tribes of Israel*.

2. The continuation, therefore, of the original thought is found in the introduction of *Hamath*. The Hebrews did not always lay claim to this region. They were never able to extend their conquests beyond Dan. See 2 S. $24^{5 ff.}$ and the expression "from Dan to Beersheba" (Ju. 20^1 1 S. 3^{20}, etc.). Ezekiel does not promise them anything beyond these limits, for, in his outline of the boundaries of the new state ($47^{15 ff.}$), as in Nu. 13^{21} (P), "the entrance to Hamath" seems to be the southern end of the great valley of Lebanon. There is, however, a series of Deuteronomic passages in which the writer (or writers) carries the northern boundary of his country to the Euphrates.* This is evidently the thought of the words now under consideration, whose author reckoned Ha-

* These passages are Gn. 15^{18} Ex. 23^{31} Dt. 1^7 11^{24} Jos. 1^4 13^5 Ju. 3^3. In the last two "the entrance to Hamath" is clearly located at the northern end of the valley of Lebanon. *Cf.* Moore, *Judges*, 80.

math also a part of the Promised Land. The earliest mention of Hamath in the Old Testament is that in Am. 6[2], where it is represented as a thriving kingdom; but it appears in an Assyrian inscription as an ally of Israel and Damascus in 854 B.C.* From that time onward, with intervals of revolt, it paid tribute to the king of Assyria until, in 720 B.C., Sargon finally crushed and repeopled it.† The city of the same name, however, being very advantageously situated on the Orontes, could not be lastingly destroyed. In the Syrian period it had become of sufficient importance to induce Antiochus IV to rename it, after himself, Epiphania. It still survives, under the name Ḥama, in spite of its unhealthy location, an important commercial centre with 50,000 inhabitants. There were other cities in northern Syria, but the three whose names are given were deemed sufficient to represent that region. Phœnicia is represented by two. In the Massoretic text they both appear in this verse, and, indeed, in the same line. The name of Tyre, however, is superfluous, and, as will appear from grammatical and metrical considerations, an interpolation. Its appearance here is explained by the fact that in Ez. 28[3 ff.] it is Tyre, and not Sidon, that is famed for its wisdom. The author of the gloss, remembering this, doubtless thought that the former name should be substituted for the latter, or the two cities should divide the contested honour. The original reading was *and Sidon, although it is very wise*. The wisdom here attributed to the mother of Phœnician cities was proverbial. The author might have quoted the words addressed to the younger city by Ezekiel: "Thou art wiser than Daniel; there is no secret that is hid from thee. By thy wisdom and thy understanding thou hast won thyself wealth, and brought gold and silver into thy coffers." It is the practical shrewdness of the successful trader, which the Phœnicians also applied in diplomacy. By its aid they were generally able to bribe their enemies, or use them one against another, and thus escape dangerous complications. Sometimes, however, their wisdom failed them. Thus, for example, when, in 351 B.C., after having worn the Persian yoke for a hundred and fifty years, the Sidonians,

* Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, ii, 75 *ff.*; *KAT.*[2], 193 *ff.*; *KB.*, i, 172 *ff.*
† Rogers, *HBA.*, ii, 154 *ff.*; *KB.*, ii, 56 *ff.*

seeing that the days of the empire were numbered, headed a movement for independence, they found that they had underrated the resources of Artaxerxes III and overestimated the courage and loyalty of their own ruler, and they saw their city destroyed with thousands of its inhabitants.* The writer may have had this unhappy event in mind. His message to the Sidonians is that with all their boasted shrewdness they cannot prevent its repetition.

3. Tyre, like Sidon, originally stood on the mainland, where the skill and courage of its people were constantly taxed to defend it; but in process of time it took possession of a little group of islands half a mile from the shore† and there *built itself a stronghold*.‡ The new site, according to Menander, was greatly enlarged and beautified by Hiram the friend of David and Solomon. It was so easily defensible that for centuries the city defied the most powerful adversaries. The Assyrians for five years, and the Babylonians under Nebuchadrezzar for thirteen, besieged it in vain.

"Hiram raised the bank in the large place and dedicated the golden pillar which is in the temple of Zeus. He also went and cut down timber on the mountain called Libanus for the roofs of temples; and when he had pulled down the ancient temples, he built both the temple of Hercules and that of Astarte." Quoted by Josephus, viii, 5, 3.

All that is known of the siege by the Assyrians is derived from Menander, who says: "The king of Assyria returned and attacked them (the Tyrians) again, the Phœnicians furnishing him with three-score ships and eight hundred men to row them. But, when the Tyrians sailed against them in twelve ships, and dispersed the enemies' ships, and took five hundred prisoners, the reputation of all the citizens of Tyre was thereby increased. Then the king of Assyria returned and placed guards at their river and aqueducts, to hinder the Tyrians from drawing water. This continued for five years, and still the Tyrians held out, and drank of the water they got from wells which they dug." The king of Assyria at that time, according to Josephus, from whose *Antiquities* (ix, 14, 2) the above quotation is taken, was Shalmaneser; but since, according to Menander, the king of Tyre was Elulaeus, and this was the name of the one that was reigning when Sennacherib invaded the country (*KB.*, ii, 90 *f.*), it is possible that, as has been suggested, the Jewish historian "made a mistake and ascribed to Shalmaneser a siege of Tyre which was really made by Sennacherib." *Cf.* Rogers, *HBA.*, ii, 146.

Josephus cites (*Ant.*, x, 11, 1) Philostratus as his authority for the length of this siege. That it resulted in failure, although Ezekiel at first ($26^{7\,ff.}$)

* Diod. Sic., xvi, 40 *ff.*

† Thereafter the original city was called Old Tyre. *Cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, ix, 14, 2; Diod. Sic., xvii, 40.

‡ The original has a play on the name of the city.

expected it to succeed, is clear from Ez. $29^{17\,ff.}$, where the prophet acknowledges that Nebuchadrezzar "had no wages, nor his army, for Tyre, for the service that he had served against it," but promises him the land of Egypt "as a recompense."

In fact Tyre was never taken until Alexander connected it by a causeway with the mainland and brought his engines to bear upon its walls. Meanwhile its merchants traversed all seas, exchanging their manufactures for the products of other countries, to the ends of the earth. Thus, in the words with which Ezekiel closes his description of its activities (27^{25}) this great emporium was "replenished and made very glorious in the heart of the seas." The present writer uses language quite as picturesque and forcible, if not so elegant, as Ezekiel's. He says that, when he wrote, the city had *heaped up silver like the dust, and gold like the mud of the streets.*—**4.** Tyre was very prosperous when this passage was written, but the author of it did not expect its prosperity to continue. Indeed he predicts the reverse. *Lo,* he says, *Yahweh will despoil it.* The next clause is capable of more than one interpretation, the crucial word, rendered *power* in EV., having several meanings; but the fact that the emphasis, thus far, has been on the wealth of the city seems to require that the text should say, *Yea, he will smite into the sea,* not *its might,** or *its bulwark,*† but its *wealth,* in the sense not only of gold and silver, but all the luxuries that these precious metals represent.‡ This is in harmony, too, with the prediction of Ezekiel (37^{27}), that the riches of the city shall "fall into the heart of the sea." Nor is this all. The city *itself,* the temples of its gods, the factories and storehouses of its commerce and the dwellings, great and small, of its inhabitants *shall be devoured by fire.* Thus the miserable remnant of its population will be left on "a bare rock," "a place to spread nets in the midst of the sea." *Cf.* Ez. $26^{4\,f.}$

5. Philistia has four representatives, and only four, Gath being omitted here as it is in Am. $1^{6\,ff.}$. Nor is this the only point of resemblance between the two passages. There are two or three expressions in this one that betray acquaintance with, but not sla-

* So Jer., Theod. Mops., New., Rosenm., Burger, Köh., Ke., Brd., Or., Reu., Sta., *et al.*
† So Mau., Hi., We., Now., Marti, GASm., *et al.*
‡ So Ew., Hd., *et al.*

vish imitation of, the other. They differ entirely with respect to the order in which the cities are introduced. Amos takes them in the order of their importance. This author follows the arrangement of Je. 25^{20}. His first, therefore, is *Ashkelon*. He predicts that this ancient city, situated on the coast, about thirty miles south of Jaffa, *shall see and fear*, that is, when it sees the devastation wrought in Phœnicia, will be smitten with fear in anticipation of a like fate. *Gaza*, whose position on the edge of the desert made it the most important place in southern Palestine long before the Philistines appeared in the country, and explains its survival, with a population of 35,000,—Gaza, he says, will be similarly and even more powerfully affected; it *shall be in great anguish*. *Ekron also*, on the northern boundary of Philistia, will share the prevailing consternation, *because its hope*, that is, as the use of the same word in Is. $20^{5\ f.}$ would indicate, the place to which it has been looking for support, *hath been put to shame*. This is clearly a reference to Tyre, which implies that the city was in alliance with Ekron and probably with the other cities of Philistia when it was written. The fears of these communities will be realised. *There shall cease to be a king in Gaza;* it will lose its independence and be incorporated into a larger political whole. A still worse fate is in store for *Ashkelon*, for it *shall not remain*,* or better, *shall not be*, that is, *shall cease to be*, *inhabited*.† These two lines betray the influence of Amos (1^8); but the order of thought is reversed, while Gaza has taken the place of Ashkelon, and Ashkelon that of Ashdod.—**6.** Thus far no mention has been made of *Ashdod*, next to Gaza the most important city of Philistia, and famous for having in the seventh century B.C. sustained the longest (27 years) siege on record.‡ The prediction with reference to it belongs at the end of the preceding verse, or rather, it and the last two clauses of the preceding verse should have been grouped together in a verse by themselves. This city is not to be deserted like Ashkelon, but its native inhabitants, or the better class of them, are to be replaced by *mongrels*, lit., *a bastard*. *Cf.* Dt. $23^{3/2}$. Here, apparently, is an allu-

* So Hi., Ew., Burger, Brd., *et al.*

† Is. 13^{20} Je. 17^6 $50^{13.\ 39}$ Ez. 29^{11}.

‡ *Cf.* Herodotus, ii, 157. Petrie suggests that this siege took place during the Scythian invasion and represents the long struggle in which Psammetichus I finally defeated the barbarians. *HE.*, ii. 331 *f.*

sion to the deterioration of the population of Palestine during and after the Captivity, as pictured in Ne. $13^{23\,f.}$, or the mixed character of the people with whom the country had been colonised by its conquerors.* There follows a stanza, only the first line of which appears in this verse, describing the discipline by which Yahweh purposes to prepare the remnant of the Philistines and their successors for incorporation among his people. The transition is marked by a change from the third to the first person. *Thus will I*, says Yahweh, *destroy the pride of the Philistines;* not any object of which they boast (Am. 8^{7}), but a disposition prompting them to follow the "devices and desires" of their own hearts without reference to the will of Yahweh. *Cf.* 10^{11} Is. 16^{6} Je. $13^{9\,f.}$, etc.—**7.** The new inhabitants, the despised mongrels, will not be of this spirit, but will submit to have Yahweh *remove their blood from their mouths*, that is, forbid them to eat blood, which the Hebrews were commanded (Dt. $12^{16.\,23\,f.}$) to "pour upon the ground like water," but which it was the custom of the Philistines and other Gentiles to eat with the flesh of their sacrifices. *Cf.* Ez. 33^{25}. He will also remove *their abominations from between their teeth;* these abominations being animals forbidden by the Mosaic law (Dt. $14^{3\,ff.}$ Lv. $11^{1\,ff.}$), such as dogs, swine and mice, which the Philistines sometimes sacrificed to their false gods and ate at their festivals. *Cf.* Is. 65^{4} $66^{3.\,17}$. The abandonment of such meats, with all that it implies, by the Philistines is the condition of their continuance in the Holy Land. Having accepted this condition, however, they will be enrolled among the Chosen People. *Cf.* 2^{11} 8^{23}. *Yea*, says the prophet, returning to the third person, and applying to these aliens a term full of the tenderest significance, *they shall become a remnant to our God.*

"Just as in the case of Israel, after they had by the penalty of deportation been winnowed, cleansed and refined, there remained a remnant that now serves Jehovah faithfully, so also the Philistine people, when Jehovah's punitive visitation has passed over them, will not be wholly annihilated, but survive in a remnant of its former being, and indeed a remnant for Israel's God; thus the Philistines also will then have become a willingly submissive and active servant of Jehovah." Köhler.

* When Alexander took Gaza, the men of the city having been killed, "he sold the women into slavery and repeopled the city from the neighbouring settlers." *Cf.* Arrianus, ii, 27.

Then there will be presented another instance of a process many times repeated in the early history of the Hebrews; for the Philistines *shall be like a family in Judah, even Ekron like the Jebusites*, the Jebusites being the early inhabitants of Jerusalem, who were not destroyed, but gradually absorbed by their Hebrew conquerors.* The prophet does not say what will become of the surviving Syrians and Phœnicians, but he would probably have admitted them to the same privileges, on the same conditions, as the Philistines.

8. The plain of Philistia lay on the route between Egypt and the regions north and east of Palestine. When, therefore, there was war between Asia and Africa the armies of the contending powers passed to and fro over it, sometimes made it the scene of conflict. At such times the Hebrews suffered only less than the Philistines. It would evidently have been for their advantage if they had been strong enough to occupy the approaches to the plain and hold them against all comers. The Jews believed that Alexander had been restrained from attacking them by Yahweh, and that he could always protect them. This verse was added for the purpose of giving expression to a prevailing faith as well as bringing the prophecy to which it is attached into closer harmony with history. *Then will I*, Yahweh is made to say, *encamp over against my house, an outpost, that none may pass to or fro.* The words betray their secondary origin, not only by their prosaic form, but by their content; for the kingdom described in v. [10] would hardly need even figurative fortifications. The most significant thing about them, however, is the phrase *my house*. Now, the house of Yahweh is generally the temple at Jerusalem. *Cf.* 1^{16} 3^{7}, etc. In Ho. 8^{1} 9^{15} and Je. $12^{7\,ff.}$, however, it is the Holy Land, and since the author of the gloss clearly has in mind the protection of the people rather than the sanctuary of Yahweh, this seems to be what is here meant by it. On this supposition the next clause, *so shall there not pass over them again an oppressor*, becomes more intelligible. The pronoun *them* refers to the people of the land and the whole clause is an assurance that the hardships which the Jews have endured

* In 1 K. 9^{20} there is a different, but less probable, representation of their condition. *Cf.* HPS., 158.

from their rival masters are ended. *Cf.* Jo. 4/3^{17}. It is these hardships to which Yahweh refers when he adds, *for now have I seen with my eyes.* On the relation of this verse to the subject of the date of vv. $^{1-7}$, see p. 253.

1. משא] 𝔊, λῆμμα; 𝔙, *onus*; 𝔖 om. On the varieties of construction, see 2 K. 9^{25} Is. 15^{1} Pr. 31^{1} Is. 13^{1}.—הדרך] 𝔊^{NB}, Σεδράχ; 𝔊^{AQ}, Σεδράκ; but some curss. have Ἀδράχ, also Aq. Σ Θ; 𝔗, דרומא, *the South.* Stade's proposal to repeat the name יהוה has been discussed in the comments and, for what seem good reasons, rejected. The emendation suggested by Is. 9$^{7/8}$ requires the insertion of ונפל before or יפל after בארץ הדרך.—מִנְחָתוֹ] 𝔊, θυσία αὐτοῦ = מִנְחָתוֹ, a serious but natural error, explained by the absence of vowels in the original text. The reading is forbidden by the measure, which requires that this word have two beats. *Cf.* v. ^{7}.—ליהוה עין אדם] These words have generally been rendered in one of two ways. The first is that of 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗, which makes them mean that *Yahweh hath an eye on man* or something equivalent. So Cyr., Grot., de D., Dru., Marck, Pem., New., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Burger, Ke., Köh., Reu., Sta., We., Now., GASm., *et al.* This rendering, if it were grammatically justifiable, would not suit the connection; for, especially if the next clause be retained, it would naturally imply a favourable attitude on the part of Yahweh, while the tone of the prophecy is for the time being hostile to the gentiles. The other rendering, *toward Yahweh is the eye of man*, namely, in adoration, which is favoured by Jer., AE., Ra., Ki., Cal., Bla., Rib., Hd., Klie., Brd., Pu., *et al.*, is grammatically somewhat less objectionable, but it is so foreign to the context that one must choose between rejecting it and pronouncing the whole clause of secondary origin. If, however, as has been shown, the next line is a gloss, this one must be retained to complete the measure. It will therefore be necessary to adopt the emendation of Klo., ערי אדם for עין אדם, until a better has been suggested. Those of Mich. (עין אדם) and Ball (עם אדם) are less attractive.—The metrical scheme on which the rest of the prophecy is constructed requires that this verse and the next together have only six lines. It is therefore necessary to omit one, and since, as has been shown in the comments, the last of this verse is superfluous, it is the one to be omitted.—**2.** חמת] 𝔊^{NB}, ἐν Ἐμάθ. 𝔊^{AQ}, however, omit the prep., and rightly, since this name, like (original) ערי of the preceding verse, is the subject of the sentence, and not the object of a ב to be supplied.—תגבל] The rel. is to be supplied. *Cf.* Ges. § 155. 2 (b) (1). Houb. would rd. בגבלתה, *in its border.*—צר] The argument against this name runs as follows: The line is overfilled. The vb., being singular, requires but one subject, and since this one lacks a connective and, moreover, is entirely unnecessary, it must be the gloss.—On כי in the sense of *though*, *cf.* Mi. 7^{8}; BDB., art.

כי, 2, b (*b*).—חכמה] 𝔊, ἐφρόνησαν = חכמו which We., *et al.*, ignoring metrical considerations, regard as the original.—**3.** צר מצור] A good example of paronomasia, like *Tyre a tower.*—ותרוץ] 𝔊AQ insert the vb. συνήγαγεν after the connective, but there is no room for one in the original.—**4.** ארני] 19 Kenn. mss., and many others collated by de R., rd. יהוה, which, since the word here found does not occur elsewhere in these chapters, may well be the original reading.—חוצות] In the expression here used the word seems to have been definite without the art. At any rate the art. is always (5 t.) omitted. *Cf.* 10[5].—בים] The position of this word, immediately after the vb., indicates that it was intended to mark, not the place *where*, but the one *whither*, the wealth will be smitten.

5. תֵּרֶא] Sometimes pointed תֵּרֶא, with the accent, which seems to have been thrown forward, in this case as in Gn. 41[33] and Mi. 7[10], to distribute the emphasis, still on the ultima] The form is jussive, but the use of the simple impf. of the co-ordinate vb., תחיל suggests that the significance of this fact might easily be exaggerated. Perhaps this form was chosen in anticipation of the co-ordinate תירא, in other words, furnishes another example of paronomasia. On the form and accent, see Ges. § 75. 6. RR. 2 (b) and 17; on the meaning, Ges. § 109. 2 (b); Bö. § 981. 7; Dr. § 58.—הוביש] For הֵבִישׁ, from בוש. *Cf.* Ges. § 78. Hiph. in the sense of Qal. For other examples, see 10[5. 11] 11[5] 12[10] 14[5].—מֶבַטָּה] On the vocalisation ֶ for ַ, see Ges. §§ 9. 2; 27. 2 (b) R. 2 (a). We. rds. מבטחה; also Now., GASm., but Marti justly objects, that, in view of Is. 20[5 f.], where the same form is found, there is no warrant for emendation.—ואבד] Note that with the beginning of the latter half of the double tristich the author returns to the regular usage with reference to the succession of vbs.—תשב] Here passive. *Cf.* Is. 13[20] Je. 17[6. 25], etc. It is a late usage, frequent in the Mishna. *Cf.* Holzinger, *ZAW.*, 1889, 115; Kö. § 98. Cp. v. [6] 2[3/4] 12[6] 14[10]. —**6.** The first clause of this verse, as explained in the comments, belongs with the last two of v. [5]. The mention of Ashdod is postponed by the second references to Gaza and Ashkelon, that it may at the same time close the enumeration and the double tristich devoted to the cities of Philistia.—ממזר] A collective, from מזר, *be bad;* hence something vile, contemptible; 𝔖, ܡܟܪܐ Che. rds. מְנְדֵּד, Ass. *mindidu, tax-gatherer; EB.*, art. *Scribe*, § 4.—**7.** והסרתי] Here begins a new stanza, the third, on the Philistines as a whole.—דמיו] If, as the use of שקציו in the next line would indicate, the blood here meant is that of animals, this is the only place in which the pl. of דם is used in that sense. Yet there is no apparent reason why it should not be so used, especially if the writer wished to convey the impression that there was a large quantity from a great number of victims. Perhaps, however, the original reading was דמו as in Kenn. 30. See also 𝔊, which in eight of the eleven cases in which the pl. occurs in the Minor Prophets follows the Heb. idiom, but in this one has the sg. The sf. is collective. Hence the word should be rendered

their, not ***his***, ***blood***. Render also ***their mouths***, ***their abominations*** and ***their teeth***. Cp. EV., where the translators have obscured the sense by following the Heb. idiom. *Cf.* Ges. § 135. 2 (c) R.—שקציו] Here only in the sense of שֶׁקֶץ, *forbidden food*, which does not occur in the pl.—כאלף] The noun, pointed as it is here, generally means *chief*, but, when thus pronounced in the sg., it always elsewhere has ו. Moreover, the meaning *chief* is not the one required in this connection. Hence Ort. and others rd. כְּאֶלֶף in the sense of *family*. *Cf.* Ju. 6^{15} 1 S. $10^{19. 21}$. So Sta., We., Now., Marti, Kit.—The last line, like the third of the first stanza, has only two words, but the second has two beats. *Cf.* v. [1].—van H., because he thinks that the sfs. in this verse refer to מזור, rearranges the lines in vv. [8 f.] as follows: vv. [7c 6a 7a-d 6b], but the prophet would hardly close with a threat of destruction.—This verse furnishes an instance of the way in which the text sometimes lends itself to the most fantastic treatment. Houb. renders אלף ***an ox***, and by a slight change in יבוסי (אבוסו) provides him with ***his stable***.—**8.** מצבה] Qr. מִצָּבָא; also some mss., 𝔙, and many exegetes. The prep. supposed to be represented by מ is sometimes rendered ***on account of*** (Dru., Hd.), but more frequently *against*, or the like. So Ra., Ki., Marck, Grot., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Burger, Ke., Pres., Kui., Rub., We., *et al.* It seems best, however, to retain the present text, pointing it, not with 𝔊 𝔖, מַצֵּבָה, but, as in 1 S. 14^{12}, מִצָּבָה. So Bö., Ort., Köh., Brd., Sta., Now., Marti, GASm., *et al.*—On מעבר ומשב, see 7^{14}.

(2) *The future ruler* ($9^{9\,f.}$).—The coming king is announced, and his character and mission described; also the extent of his kingdom.

9. In the preceding prophecy, as originally written, there was no reference to the territory occupied at any time by the Hebrews. It was taken for granted that it would be restored to them as a united people. This implies the resumption by Jerusalem of its ancient pre-eminence as the national capital. It is natural, therefore, that here the scene should be laid in the Holy City, or, to adopt the author's figure, that she should welcome the promised king. The prophet bids her *exult*, yes, *shout*, giving unrestrained expression to her joy. He calls her, first, literally, ***daughter Sion***, the word ***daughter*** being little more than a sign of personification as a female; which, however, for the sake of greater definiteness may be rendered *fair* or ***comely***. The reason for exultation is found in the announcement, ***Lo, thy king shall come to thee***, which completes the sense and closes the first tristich. The rest of the verse con-

stitutes another the theme of which is the character of the king. He is *just*. This term has various shades of meaning. Thus, it denotes the impartiality that should characterise the ideal judge; and at first sight, it seems as if here, as in Is. 11^4 and Je. 23^5, this were the quality attributed to him.* The king of this passage, however, differs greatly from the one predicted by the other two prophets. The writer was evidently acquainted with the Servant of Yahweh as pictured by the Second Isaiah. Indeed, he seems here to have undertaken to combine this conception with that of a royal conqueror.

It was the difficulty of combining the two that finally led the Jews to accept the doctrine that there would be two Messiahs, a son of David who would live and reign forever, and a son of Joseph who must precede the other and "by his death provide atonement and expiation for the sins of Israel, opening to the regal Messiah and his people the way to the creation of the glorious kingdom" for which they waited. *Cf.* Weber, *Altsynagogale palästinische Theologie*, 346 *f.*

It is probable, therefore, that, in calling his king *just*, he had in mind the vindication promised the suffering Servant. *Cf.* Is. 50^8 $53^{11\,f.}$. This sort of justness is closely related to salvation, deliverance. In Is. 45^8 62^1 and elsewhere they are treated as substantially synonymous. This being the case, it is not surprising to find that the second term here used, which is rendered *victorious*, as it should be also, for example, in Dt. 33^{29}, is really a passive participle which, in another connection, might properly be translated *saved* or *delivered*. In other words, the person here described, though still a king, is not the proud and confident figure of the earlier prophecies. See Is. $9^{5/6}$ Mi. $5^{3/4}$, etc. He is victorious, not in himself or anything that he personally commands, but by the grace, and in the might, of the God of Israel. *Cf.* Ps. $20^{7/6}$ 33^{16}. His triumph, therefore, is the triumph of the faith of the Servant of Yahweh. *Cf.* Is. 49^4 $50^{7\,ff.}$. A triumph of this kind, while it forbids pride, ought not to produce an effect in any sense or degree unhappy. Therefore, although the third epithet is generally best rendered by *afflicted* or one of its synonyms, it is better in this case, as in Ps. $18^{28/27}$, for example, following the

* So Mau., Ke., Or., Reu., *et al.*

Targum and the Greek and Syriac versions, to translate it *humble*.* This rendering harmonises with the following context, where the king is described as manifesting his humility by making his entry into his capital *mounted*, not on a prancing horse suggesting war and conquest, but *on an ass*.† With the picture here presented compare Je. 22^4, with its "kings riding in chariots and on horses." The difference between the two shows how great a change took place in the ideals and expectations of the Jews during and after the Exile.—**10.** A king of the character described could not be expected to take any pleasure in arms. The writer is consistent, therefore, in giving him no part in the subjugation of the hitherto unconquered portions of his kingdom; also in predicting that on his accession he will *destroy the chariot from Ephraim, and the horse from Jerusalem*. It is a mistake to infer from these words that the kingdoms of Israel and Judah were in existence when they were written; and equally erroneous to suppose that chariots were then used only in the northern, and horses only in the southern, part of the country. The words are arranged as they are to satisfy the Hebrew fondness for parallelism. What they mean is that the king will banish both chariots and horses for military purposes from his entire dominion. If the name Ephraim has any special significance, it must have been intended to remind the reader that in the good time coming all the tribes would be reunited. *Cf.* Je. 3^{18} 23^6, etc. In that day not only chariots and horses, the more imposing paraphernalia of militarism, but *the war bow*, the bow so far as it is used in war, *shall be destroyed*. In Mi. $5^{9/10\,f.}$ horses and chariots are devoted to destruction because they, like witches, idols, etc., are offensive to Yahweh. Here, however, as in Ho. 1^7 and $2^{20/18}$, both of which are postexilic, it is because they are no longer needed, Yahweh, who has wrought the restoration of his people, being their sufficient protection. *Cf.* $2^{9/5}$. Nor will the reign of peace be confined to the Promised Land. The king to be, the Prince of Peace of Is. $9^{5/6}$, *will also speak peace to the nations*. This statement, in the light of Is. 42^2, where the Servant

* Mt. 21^5, of course, follows the Greek. Jn. 12^{15} does not reproduce this part of the prophecy.

† Note that the prophet does not, as Mt. 21^7 would lead one to suppose, predict the use of two asses, but, as Jn. 12^{12} puts it, a single young animal.

of Yahweh is represented as bringing forth justice for the nations, seems to mean that he will act as arbiter among the peoples, and by the justice of his decisions make appeals to arms unnecessary. "One nation shall" then "not uplift the sword against another, neither shall they learn war any more." *Cf.* Mi. 4^{3} (Is. 2^{4}) Is. $42^{1.\,4}$. The final clause further defines the nature and extent of the king's authority. *He shall rule*, it says, *from sea to sea, and from the River to the ends of the earth.* The terms used are not without ambiguity. For example, it is not clear whether *from sea to sea* has, as some assert, the same force as "from the rising of the sun to its setting" (Ps. 50^{1})* or refers to definite bodies of water. The latter view has in its favour the following considerations: (1) The operations preparatory to the advent of the king, as described in the preceding prophecy, are confined to a limited area. (2) The Hebrews are elsewhere taught to expect final possession of a country with definite, if not always the same, limits. *Cf.* Ex. 23^{31} Nu. $34^{1\,ff.}$ Ez. $47^{15\,ff.}$. (3) The northern boundary here given, clearly the Euphrates, being the same as in various other passages, it is reasonable to suppose that the seas correspond to those by which, according to the same passages, the territory described was to a great extent enclosed, namely, the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. True, on the fourth, or south, side there is no definite limit, but this is not strange in view of the nature of the country, there being no great obstacle to expansion in that direction. The teaching of the passage, therefore, seems to be that, while the coming king, like Solomon (1 K. $10^{1\,ff.}$) and the Servant of Yahweh (Is. 49^{7}), will exert an influence upon, and receive homage from, the nations of the earth, his proper kingdom will be western Palestine in its ideal dimensions. For a later and more extravagant form of this prophecy, see Ps. 72^{8-12}.

There can hardly be a question about the relation of this to the preceding prophecy. They have the same poetical form, and were therefore doubtless intended to supplement each other. As a whole they admirably illustrate the persistence of the Messianic hope among the Hebrews. The author, apparently, as soon as Alexander appeared on his horizon, saw in the young Greek, not only the conqueror of Asia, but the forerunner of a ruler who would

* So Jer., Theodoret, Rosenm., Burger, Köh., Ke., Hd., Brd., *et al.*

restore the kingdom of David and make it the admiration of the world. The first part of the prophecy was fulfilled in a measure when Alexander took possession, one after another, of the cities named and many others. The second part was not fulfilled, but it furnished an ideal, faith in which was only less comforting and edifying than its realisation.

9. גילי] With the accent on the ultima. *Cf.* 13^{7}; Ges.$^{§ 72. 7. R. 2}$.—לך] For אליך; not common. *Cf.* 2 S. 12^{4} Am. 6^{1}, etc.; BDB., art. ל, $^{1. 2 (b)}$. This word closes the first tristich, and therefore should have received *athnach*.—צדיק] Not an accusative after יבוא, but, like נושע a predicate of the pronoun הוא.—נושע] New., following 𝔊 𝔏 (*σώζων*), rds. מֹשִׁעַ, Kit. the fuller form מושיע; but, as appeared in the comments, the present text is supported by usage.—עני] In the sense of ענו. So 𝔊 Aq. (*πραΰς*) 𝔖 (ܡܟܝܟ) 𝔗 (ענותן). The confusion between the two arose from the development in the signification of the former. *Cf. DB.*, art. *Poor;* Rahlfs, עני *und* ענו *in den Psalmen*, 89. There are eight passages in which the Mas. corrected the text, five (Ps. $9^{13/12}$ 10^{12} Pr. 3^{34} 14^{21} 16^{19}) in which they point עניים with the vowels of ענוים, and three (Am. 8^{4} Is. 32^{7} Ps. $9^{18/17}$) in which they have made the reverse change.—ועל] The ו is explicative. *Cf.* Gn. 4^{4}, etc.; Ges.$^{§ 154. note (b)}$; Kö.$^{§ 375 e}$.—אתנות] A pl. of species best translated by the sg. *Cf.* Gn. 38^{17} 1 S. 17^{7} Is. 50^{4}, etc.; Ges.$^{§ 124. 1. R. 2}$; Kö.$^{§ 264 a}$.—The evangelists in citing this passage treated it with unusual freedom, as can be seen by a comparison between Mt. 21^{5} and Jn. 12^{15} on the one hand and the Heb. or Greek of Zechariah on the other:

Hebrew.	*Greek.*	*Matthew.*	*John.*
1 גילי מאר בת ציון	χαῖρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σειών.	Εἴπατε τῇ θυγατρὶ Σιών	Μὴ φοβοῦ, θυγάτηρ Σιών,
2 הריעי בת ירושלם	κήρυσσε θύγατερ Ἰερουσαλήμ.		
3 הנה מלכך יבוא לך	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί σοι	Ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεταί σοι	ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἔρχεται
4 צדיק ונושע הוא	δίκαιος καὶ σώζων, αὐτὸς		
5 עני ורכב	πραῢς καὶ ἐπιβεβηκὼς	πραῢς ἐπιβεβηκὼς	καθήμενος
על חמור	ἐπὶ ὑποζύγιον	ἐπὶ ὄνον	
6 ועל עיר בן אתנות	καὶ πῶλον νέον	καὶ ἐπὶ πῶλον υἱὸν ὑποζυγίου	ἐπὶ πῶλον ὄνου.

It will be observed that neither of the evangelists quotes the first (metrical) line, but that Matthew borrows an altogether different clause from Is. 62^{11}, while John seems to have had in mind Is. 54^{4}, where, although the name does not occur, the daughter of Sion is addressed as clearly as in $52^{1\,ff.}$. Both omit lines 2 and 4, and John condenses 5 and 6 into a single clause, the result being that Matthew has a stanza of four and John one of three lines in the original measure. Note also that Matthew quotes the original as far as he goes, while John follows neither it nor 𝔊.—**10.** והכרתי] The change of subject disturbs the flow of thought. In 𝔊 𝔖 it remains the same. Rd., therefore, והכרית, *and he*, etc. So Houb., New., Sta., We., Now., Marti, Kit., van H.—רכב] Observe that the art. with ה is not found in vv. $^{1-10}$ and that it occurs only 4 t. without this consonant. The entire omission of it with this and the two following nouns may be due to the poetical character of the passage, Ges. $^{\S\,126.\,2\,(a)\,R.}$; Kö. $^{\S\,292a}$: or this may be another case like the מלך of v. ^{4}, *a chariot* being equivalent to *every chariot*. *Cf.* Ho. 3^{4}.—ונכרתה] 𝔊$^{B\Gamma}$, ἐξολεθρεύσεται = והכרית; so 𝔖; but 𝔊$^{\aleph^{c}AQ}$ 𝔙 𝔖^{H} 𝔗 have the passive.—ודבר שלום] 𝔊, καὶ πλῆθος καὶ εἰρήνη = ורב ושלום.—ומנהר] One of five instances in which נהר, when it means the Euphrates, wants the art. The others are Is. 7^{20}, where, according to Che., בעברי נהר should be בעבר הנהר, Je. 2^{18}, where Kenn. 1 has הנהר, Mi. 7^{12}, and Ps. 72^{8}, the last, according to Baethgen, copied from this passage.

The prophecies of vv. $^{1-10}$ were written for the Jews of the latter part of the fourth century B.C., but in their present form they serve a new purpose, namely, to introduce a series of oracles of a considerably later date, the first of which deals with

b. A promise of freedom and prosperity (9^{11-17}).

Yahweh promises to restore the exiled Jews, inspire them with courage to meet their oppressors, assist them in the conflict and thenceforward bestow upon them his favour and protection.

11. The prophet, having, by means of the borrowed passage (vv. $^{1-10}$), given the reader a glimpse of Yahweh's ultimate purpose, returns to the present and addresses Sion in her actual condition. *O thou*, he begins, *for the blood of thy covenant I will also release thy prisoners from the pit*. The prisoners in question are the Jews still in exile. The Persian as well as the Babylonian empire has been overthrown, yet many of the children of Sion remain scattered in other countries. Yahweh declares that he has released them, or

is on the point of releasing them, and gives his reason for so doing. It is found in the blood of a covenant which is described as Sion's; but, since a covenant requires two parties, and in this case the second is the speaker himself, *thy covenant* is clearly equivalent to *my covenant with thee*. The blood of this covenant is naturally the blood of the sacrifices with which it was sealed. When did the ceremony occur? There are those who find here an allusion to the covenant at Sinai. *Cf.* Ex. $24^{5\,ff.}$.* Others deny that there is a reference to any historical event, claiming that the sacrifice is the daily offering of the temple.† It seems still better, since the relation of the Jews to their country is concerned, to suppose, with Pemble, that the writer had in mind the original covenant between Yahweh and Abraham described in Gn. $15^{9-12.\ 17\,f.}$, on which they based their title to Canaan and of which the one at Sinai was only a repetition and the daily sacrifice a reminder. It was their neglect of this covenant that moved Yahweh to drive them from the country, and it is his faithfulness to it that explains the promise of a restoration. *Cf.* Je. $34^{17\,ff.}$, where there is an unmistakable allusion to the ceremony at Hebron. On the circumstantial phrase, *with no water in it*, which is clearly a gloss, see the critical notes.—**12.** The writer gives the exiles, or some of them, the credit of having an interest in their own country and a readiness to return to it under favourable conditions. He believes that the time is ripe for such a movement, and therefore, according to the original reading, represents Yahweh, not as inviting these exiles to return, but as promising that *the*, not merely hopeful, but *expectant, prisoners shall return*. The Massoretic text, as generally rendered, directs them to return *to the fortress*. There are, however, metrical reasons, which will be explained in the critical notes, for suspecting the correctness of this reading. Moreover, it is unintelligible. Sion is here personified. It is therefore inconsistent, in a speech addressed to her, to represent her exiles as returning to a fortress. These difficulties can best be avoided by rejecting the troublesome phrase, since, whether

* So AE., Ra., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Burger, Hd., Köh., Ke., Brd., Wri., Or., Kui., *et al.*

† So Du., *Theol.*; Now., Marti.

rightly or wrongly translated, it evidently has no place in this connection. At the same time it is necessary to omit certain other words with which the measure has been overloaded. The couplet of which the verse originally consisted will then read,

The expectant prisoners shall return;
Twofold will I restore to thee.

The recompense here promised includes not merely a great increase in population, like that predicted in Is. $54^{1\,ff.}$, but an abundance of everything that produces genuine prosperity and happiness; all this, according to the gloss wrongly rendered *to the fortress*, will be given in exchange *for trouble*, the suffering of the past. On this gloss and the parenthetical clause, *this day also I declare*, see Is. 61^{7}.—**13.** This will be the result. There will be opposition to its achievement, but Yahweh will triumph, using as his instrument the people he has chosen. Note, now, the tone and temper of the discourse as compared with vv. $^{9\,f.}$. *I will bend me Judah*, use them as a bow, he says, and this *bow will I set*, lit., *fill*, as with an arrow, *with Ephraim*. The long-sundered tribes will be united in a single weapon. *Cf.* Is. $11^{12\,ff.}$. In the latter half of the verse, which should form a second couplet, the same idea is repeated with variations. In the first place, the speaker, Yahweh, resumes the form of direct address, the one addressed being Sion. In the Massoretic text Greece (Yawan), also, is in the vocative, but this is certainly an error. Indeed, the whole clause to which the name belongs must for metrical reasons be pronounced an interpolation. Thus emended the second couplet reads,

I will arouse thy sons, Sion,
And I will make thee like the sword of a mighty man.

The mention of Greece in this connection, even in a gloss, is not without significance, for it doubtless embodies the authorised Jewish interpretation of an early date. Jerome says that in his time the Jews interpreted it as a reference "to the times of the Maccabees, who conquered the Macedonians, and, after a space of three years and six months, cleansed the temple defiled by idolatry"; and Rashi in his paraphrase makes Yahweh say, "After

Antiochus takes the kingdom from the hand of the king of Persia, and they ill-treat you, I will bend Judah, that they may be to me like a war bow, and they shall make war against Antiochus in the days of the Hasmoneans." It must, however, be remembered, that this gloss is earlier than the Greek Version, and that when it was inserted Egypt as well as Syria was a Greek kingdom.

14. In the midst of the conflict Yahweh *will appear* in person. Here, as in other places in the Old Testament, he is represented as coming in a storm. *Cf.* especially Na. 1^{3} Ps. $18^{8/7\,\text{ff.}}$ $29^{3\,\text{ff.}}$. This being the case, it is more probable that the writer intended to say that Yahweh would appear *above them* than *on their account*, for their defence. From his cloud chariot *his arrow shall go forth as lightning*. *Cf.* Hb. 3^{11} Ps. $18^{15/14}$ $77^{18/17}$ 144^{6}, etc. Meanwhile, as earthly warriors *blow the trumpet* (Ju. $7^{19\,\text{ff.}}$) he will send forth dreadful blasts of thunder to terrify his and his people's enemies (Ps. $18^{14/13}$ $29^{3\,\text{ff.}}$) as he comes *in the tempests of the South*. The original abode of Yahweh was in the South; hence the poets represent him as coming from that direction. *Cf.* Ju. 5^{4} Dt. 33^{2} Hb. 3^{3}; also Ex. 3^{18} 1 K. 19^{8}, etc.—**15.** *Yahweh of Hosts*, the God of battles, will be present, not only to frighten and destroy the enemy, but to *protect*, as with a shield,* his people, so that missiles hurled at them will fall harmless at their feet, and *they shall trample on sling-stones*, like leviathan turn them into "stubble." *Cf.* Jb. $41^{20/28}$; also Is. 54^{17}. Thus protected, they will riot in slaughter, or, in the figurative language of the (corrected) text, *drink blood like wine, and be filled*, drenched, with it *like the corners of an altar*. The latter figure is an allusion to the custom of sprinkling more or less of the blood of sacrifices upon the altar. *Cf.* Ex. 24^{8} Lv. 1^{5}, etc. This was done, according to tradition, by dashing the blood from the bowl in which it had been caught against two opposite corners in such a way that it would spatter the adjacent sides. The thought seems to be that, just as the altar dripped with the blood of the sacrifices, so these warriors, with the help of Yahweh, will drench themselves in the blood of their enemies. *Cf.* Is. 1^{15} Ez. 9^{9}, etc. Some one who took the term *fill* too literally has added a second simile, *like a bowl*, that is, one of the large vessels in which

* *Cf.* Gn. 15^{1} Ps. $18^{3/2.\ 31/30}$, etc.

the blood of slaughtered animals was caught. *Cf.* Am. 6^6; *DB.*, art. *Bason.*

16. This wild and bloody picture, which seems to have been suggested by Ez. $39^{17\,ff.}$, warrants one in expecting a conclusion equally thrilling and terrible. *Cf.* Am. $2^{2\,f.}$. This expectation is not realised. Suddenly the sun of peace bursts forth, the traces of the recent struggle are effaced and the scene becomes wholly idyllic. The beauty of the picture, as the writer conceived it, is marred by the changes that have been made in the text, and the occidental reader is further prevented from appreciating it by his unfamiliarity with oriental scenery. The first two lines, with the necessary emendations, the omission of the phrase *in that day* and the restoration of the verb *feed*, read,

> *Thus will Yahweh their God save them,*
> *Like a flock will he feed his people.*

The remaining lines of the verse are usually rendered and interpreted as a second and independent simile. Thus AV. has *the stones of a crown lifted up as an ensign above his land*, which was so inconsistent and unintelligible that the Revisers substituted the simpler rendering, *the stones of a crown lifted on high over his land*, at the same time placing in the margin, as an alternate for *lifted on high*, the reading *shimmering upon.* Recent critics, failing to find, even in the latter, anything to connect this comparison with the preceding, and ignoring metrical considerations, incline, with Wellhausen, to reject the whole clause, with the exception of the words *on his soil.* If they had ever seen one of the little plains of Palestine in the spring, dotted with sheep, white and brown, grazing under a brilliant oriental sun, they could understand why the writer, after comparing his people to a flock, added, as he seems to have done,

> *Like stones for a crown shall they be,*
> *Glittering on his soil.*

—**17.** The prophecy as originally written closed with v. [16]. One feels, as one reads it, that it should end there. This verse, therefore, at once strikes the critical reader as superfluous. On exam-

ining it he finds that both in form and content it is inconsistent with those that precede. In the first place, it contains only three lines, while all the other verses have four. Then, too, the author of it is of a different mind from his predecessor. To him the ideal life is not that of the shepherd, but that of the tiller of the soil, and the ideal condition that ***when grain causeth youths, and must causeth maidens, to flourish.*** Not that the grain is for the young men and the must, when fermented, for the young women, but that both in abundance are required by an increasing population. On the fruitfulness of the Palestine of the coming age, see Is. 4^{2} $30^{23\,f.}$ Ez. 34^{26} Am. 9^{13} Ps. 72^{16}, etc.

The structure of vv. $^{11-17}$ is not so regular as that of vv. $^{1-10}$, but there is no difficulty in perceiving that the tristich has given place to the tetrastich, and that there are five such divisions more or less distorted by errors and glosses in this prophecy, the first and the last having suffered most severely. In 𝔐 the section to which these verses belong begins with v. ^{9} and closes with 10^{2}; but vv. $^{9\,f.}$ are in a different measure and 10^{1-2} are needed to prepare the way for what follows.—**11**. גם] The person here addressed is the same as in v. ^{9}. The particle, therefore, applies not so much to the subject as to the thought of the entire sentence. Hence, it is properly rendered *also* in connection with the vb. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§\,153}$. If the prophecy that begins at this point is later than vv. $^{1-10}$, the particle is doubly appropriate.—את] Rib. accuses the Jews of having tampered with the text of this verse, dropping a ה from the pronoun and changing the sf. of בריתך and אסיריך from the masc. to the fem. gender; but, since it is clear from the context that, as has just been observed, the writer had Sion in mind, and not its future king, the charge must be dismissed. The pronoun is an independent subject anticipating the just-mentioned sf. *Cf.* Gn. 9^{9}; Ges. $^{§\,143\,(a)\,(a)}$.—בדם] The prep. has a causal significance, as in Gn. 18^{28} Dt. 24^{16}. *Cf.* BDB., art. ב, iii, 5.—בריתך] $𝔊^{AQ}$ om. the sf., $𝔊^{NB}$ 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 follow 𝔐. The sf. is an obj. gen., since only on this interpretation can there be found in the covenant in question a motive for divine action. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§\,128.\,2\,(b)}$.—שלחתי] 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, misled by את, have the 2 sg. masc., but 𝔐 is supported by the context. *Cf.* אשיב, v. ^{12}. On the tense, the pf. denoting the imminence of the given act, see Ges. $^{§\,106.\,3\,(a)}$.—אין מים בו] Clearly a gloss. (1) It disturbs the measure. (2) It adds a thought unnatural in this connection. (3) It is easily explained as a reminiscence of Gn. 37^{24} or Je. 38^{6}, probably, since the Jews interpreted בור as meaning Egypt, the former. It is merely an example of misapplied rabbinical learning.—**12**. שובו] Four Kenn. mss. have שבו, from ישב, doubtless the reading from which

𝔊 got *καθήσεσθε* and 𝔖 ܬܒܘ. This reading, however, does not suit the context, which requires a form of שוב; not, indeed, the imv. of the text, although it is supported by 𝔍 𝔗, but ישובו, or better,—for this requires merely the transposition of the first two letters of the present text,—ושבו. So Marti.—לבצרון] Here only. Whether the first word of this verse be an imv. or a pf. with ו, it requires, to complete it, the third and the fourth, and these three make a line corresponding to the two in the preceding verse. In other words, לבצרון is superfluous, at least in this connection. This being the case, there are two ways of disposing of it, either to transfer it to the next line or to remove it entirely. But the first method is impracticable, because the next line is already much too long. There seems, therefore, nothing to do but pronounce it a gloss; unless it be to find an explanation for it. The following is suggested: In Ps. 9 and 10 there occurs the word בַּצָּרָה in the sense of *trouble*. It is certainly possible that בצרון is a mistake for this word, or an Aramaic form of it, that לבצרון was first a marginal gloss to משנה וג׳, and that it was inserted where it now stands by a careless copyist.—גם היום מגיד] These words also must be of a secondary character. (1) They disturb the metrical scheme of the original author. (2) They are parenthetical and explanatory. (3) They seem to have been intended to recall Is. 61[7]. The subject of מגיד, the pron. of the first person, is to be supplied. *Cf.* Ges.[§ 116. 5 (c) R. 2]; Bö.[§ 997. 4. B]; Kö.[§ 324 n].—**13.** קשת] The Vrss. connect this word with the first line. So also Theod. Mops., Lu., Hi., Ew., Burger, Köh., Ke., Klie., Or., We., Now., *et al.* The measure and the accentuation, however, require that it be attached to what follows. So Jer., Ra., Marck, Dru., New., Rosenm., Mau., Ort., Hd., Brd., Pu., Lowe, Marti, *et al.* The objection by Now., that if it were the object of מלאתי it would have the art., ignores the fact that the art. is repeatedly omitted in this prophecy where the prose idiom would require it. *Cf.* סבור, v. [11]; גבור, v. [13]; קלע, v. [15]; מזבח, v. [15]. The recognition of the Massoretic punctuation carries with it the rejection of various interpretations for the words that follow, for it is clear that, if it belongs to the second line, it must be the object of מלאתי while אפרים can only be an acc. of that with which the object is filled. *Cf.* Ges.[§ 117. 4. R. 4 (b)].—ועוררתי] This vb., in Po., most frequently has the meaning *arouse*, but it is also used in the sense of *brandish*, and Wright so renders it in this instance. Now. objects, but his points are not well taken. In the first place, the word, when used in the latter sense, is not always followed by חנית. See Is. 10[26], where the object is שוט, *a scourge*. It is therefore not necessary to supply חנית in this instance and thus "put into the mouth of the prophet two mutually exclusive figures"; but, just as in the immediately preceding couplet the weapon which is the object of comparison in the first must be supplied from the second line, so here *as a sword* may be borrowed, to complete the thought, from the parallel clause. While, therefore, it may be best, as a concession to occidental taste, to render the vb. in question *arouse*, it

is more than probable that the author really thought of Yahweh as *brandishing* his people against their enemies. *Cf.* Ez. 32[10], where it is possible that בעופפי should be emended to בשׁררי.—על בניך יון] As has already been intimated, the words from ועוררתי onward evidently contain a parallelism. When, however, an attempt is made to arrange them symmetrically they refuse to be so assorted. Indeed, when they are divided according to the sense, even if, with 𝔊 Aq. Σ, בניך[2] be changed to בני, the first line has nearly twice the length of the second. Marti attempts to correct this discrepancy by omitting both ציון and בניך[2]. So Kit. This is only partially satisfactory, since, by the removal of ציון, the sf. of בניך[1] loses its antecedent and becomes less easily intelligible. If, however, this name is retained, it completes the first line, and the only way to restore the symmetry of the couplet is to drop על בניך יון, or, as Marti and others read it, על בני יון. So van H.—ושׂמתיך] One would expect ושׂמתים. If the present reading is retained, it must be explained as a case of attraction.

14. The metrical form is here very regular, but there is one word too many in the third line. Omit, therefore, either ואדני or the יהוה following, preferably, with Marti, the former. *Cf.* v. [15].—**15.** The text of this verse is not in so good condition. In the first place, צבאות, which occurs only once (10[3]) elsewhere in chs. 9–11, and there as an interpolation, should be cancelled.—ואכלו] If the line now beginning with this word were coupled with the next one, the thought of eating would be in place, and it would be worth while to attempt to emend the words that follow to bring them into harmony with it. Thus, *e. g.*, for וכבשו אבני קלע one might suggest כבשׂר איביהם. Since, however, the line forms a couplet with the one that precedes, and makes complete sense without ואכלו, there can be little doubt that, just as in Is. 21[5] some one has supplied the vbs. for eating and drinking after a description of the preparation of a table, so here a scribe with more zeal for reality than taste for poetry has supplied ואכלו to correspond to the ושתו of the next line. The alternative to this method of disposing of the word is, with Klostermann, to change it to ויכלו. So Kui., We., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit.—אבני קלע] These words are perfectly intelligible after וכבשו, without ואכלו. It is therefore unnecessary to resort to further emendation in this line. Flügge's suggestion, בני קלע = בני יון, too readily accepted by We. and others, must certainly be rejected if the על בני יון of v. [13] is ungenuine.—והמו] This is the reading preferred by Baer and supported by 20 Kenn. and 16 de R. mss., but the great majority of the mss. omit the connective, and so, apparently, did those from which 𝔊 and 𝔖 were made. It is more than probable, however, that both are incorrect, and that the key to the original reading is found in the τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν of 𝔊[ℵc. a. e. b AQΓL]. Not that דמם was indubitably the original reading, as Houb. and the later critics maintain. All these seem to have overlooked the fact that the sf. of דמם, if it were substituted for המו or והמו, would have no ante-

cedent, unless, like that of עליהם, it referred to the Jews, which is hardly possible. If, therefore, the text, or texts, on which the Greek mss. cited were based had רמם, they should have pronounced it רִמָּם = רמים, and rendered it simply *αἷμα*, or, after the Heb. idiom, which they sometimes followed, *αἵματα*, without *αὐτῶν*. This is a bold and cruel figure, but the next line warrants one in believing that it expresses the thought of the author.—The last line also is overloaded. The testimony of 𝔊 is to the effect that כזוית is the word that should be omitted, but, since the translators evidently misunderstood the passage, their evidence is not convincing. Moreover, the fact that, although either could be construed with מזבח, כזוית presents a more natural and impressive picture, indicates that it is original and that therefore כמזרק is an interpolation. So Marti, Kit.

16. והושיעם] The sf. is superfluous in the present condition of the text, and is actually omitted by Kenn. 30; but see below.—אלהיהם] Here again it is necessary to choose between two Greek readings, for although ℵB have this word, in AQΓ it is wanting. The former probably represents the original text. It certainly completes the line more satisfactorily than ביום ההוא. If, however, the former is retained, the latter must be sacrificed to the requirements of the measure. So Marti, Kit.—The first line having been restored, it is necessary to find a mate for it. This is fortunately not a very difficult task. First, if והושיעם is correct, there must have been another vb. to correspond to it. Moreover, it must have been one of which Yahweh was the subject and with which the simile *like a flock* could appropriately be employed. These requirements are met by רעה, and We. is no doubt correct in inserting the impf. of this word, thus producing a second line, כצאן ירעה עמו, corresponding to the one already discovered. He is not so happy in his rejection of the latter half of this verse, for, since v. 17 is in a different measure, there must be found here two lines to complete the closing stanza. This can be done by reading, with We., כאבני for כי אבני and inserting after נזר the pron. המה, the same being necessary to complete the sense and give the first line the required length. On the appropriateness of the simile thus produced, see the comments. *Cf.* the radical and unrhythmical revision,—עמי for עמו, אֶבֶר נֵצֶר for אבן נזר and ארמתי for ארמתו,—proposed by van H., who claims that the latter part of the verse, from כצאן onward, should change places with 10[1].—**17.** Two reasons for regarding this verse as an addition to the original text have already been given in the comments. They cannot be met by adopting for the latter half Marti's reading, viz., רגן ותירוש ינובו בה, for, although this line would be of about the proper length, it would still make discord with the context. Moreover, if, as above claimed, the preceding couplet is genuine, this verse, whether a distich or a tristich, falls outside the scheme of the author.—טובו, יפיו] We. rds. טובה, יפיה, the antecedent of the sf. being ארמה.

c. The plan of restoration (10^1–11^3).

The prophet in a word points out the cause of past misfortunes, then describes the means by which Yahweh purposes to restore his people to their country. He will give them strength and courage to resist and overcome their oppressors, and finally gather them from the remotest regions to which they have been banished. The prophecy closes with a lament for the powers that must perish in the conflict.

1. The discourse opens with a command. This command, however, is not addressed to any particular person or persons. Like certain questions with which the Hebrew prophets sometimes enlivened their utterances, it is merely a rhetorical device for bringing a truth more forcibly to the attention of those to whom it is addressed. In Je. 14^{22} the doctrine here taught is actually put into the form of a rhetorical question, "Are there among the nonentities of the nations (any) that can cause rain"? *Cf.* also Jb. $38^{25\,ff.}$. When, therefore, the writer here says, *Ask of Yahweh rain*, it is as if he had said in so many words, *Yahweh sendeth rain*. This he himself at once makes clear by adopting the declarative form for the parallel clause, *Yahweh causeth lightnings*. The lightnings are here not, as in 1^{14}, weapons of the Almighty, but the accompaniment of welcome showers. *Cf.* Je. 10^{13} Ps. 135^7 Jb. 28^{26} $38^{25\,ff.}$, etc. In the second passage cited from Job this thought is developed poetically. There Yahweh is described as cleaving a channel for the rain and a way for the lightning, "Causing rain on a land where there is no man, On a desert with no men in it." The next couplet, "Satisfying waste and desolate ground, And causing the thirsty soil to put forth verdure," is in the same key. This author is more prosaic, or, perhaps, has a more practical end in view, namely, to show from whom all blessings flow. He therefore adds, *yea, the rain-shower he giveth*, not *to you*, as some, following the Syriac Version, would read, but *to them*, that is, to men, and, as the effect of such abundant moisture, *to each herbage in the field*, that is, in his field. *Cf.* Je. 5^4 Ps. $104^{13\,ff.}$ 147^8 Jb. 5^{10}.—**2.** If the teaching of v. [1] is a general truth, it was as true generations

before as it was when these words were written. As a matter of fact, it was clearly taught, in one form or another, by the earliest of the writing prophets. *Cf.* Am. $4^{7\,ff.}$ Ho. 2^8, etc. The author of this prophecy was perfectly acquainted with the fact. Indeed, he now proceeds, as if v. [1], like $7^{9\,f.}$, were a quotation from "the former prophets," and he had added Ho. 2^5, "Their mother played the harlot; for she said, I will go after my lovers that give me my bread and my water, my wool and my flax, my oil and my drink." His next words are, ***but the teraphim spake wickedness, and the diviners saw falsehood***. The teraphim were idols. This is clear from Gn. 31^{30}, where Laban calls those stolen by Rachel his "gods." They were, therefore, probably made in the semblance of human beings.* They were kept at shrines (Ju. 17^5 $18^{18\,ff.}$), but they were also found in private houses.† Here, as in Ez. $21^{26/21}$, they are among the instruments of the diviners, a class of persons who made a business of securing by various, at this time illicit, methods supposed information for those who consulted them.‡ They are all repudiated by the great prophets, but some of them were once considered perfectly legitimate.§ Here the diviners are represented as clothing their falsehoods in the form of prophetic utterances. This idea is further developed, but the change in the tenses, and the redundancy of the two clauses devoted to it, indicate that they are from a later pen. On the other hand, the latter half of the verse, which Marti and others would omit, being a natural conclusion to the preceding line of thought as above interpreted, must be retained. It describes the result of turning from Yahweh, the real source of all blessings, to the devices of mountebanks. ***Therefore***, says the prophet, recalling the overthrow, not of Ephraim only, but of both the Hebrew kingdoms, ***they were scattered***, suddenly and violently dispersed, ***like a flock*** caught in a tempest. See v. [6]; also 7^{14} and Ho. 13^3, in both of which the verb is the one that seems originally to have been used in this

* The same inference has been drawn from 1 S. $19^{13\,ff.}$; but unfairly, for in the original the pronouns which in EV. make the teraphim appear a single figure are conspicuous by their absence, "at the head thereof" meaning at the head of the bed.

† *Cf.* Gn. 31^{30} 1 S. 19^{13}.

‡ On the different forms of divination, see Dt. $18^{10\,f.}$; *EB.*, art. *Divination.*

§ *Cf.* 1 S. $14^{36\,ff.}$ 19^{13}, etc.

passage. This, however, was but the beginning of a long tale of sorrows. Thereafter, in the words of Hosea (3^{4}), they abode "many days without king, and without prince, and without sacrifice." Indeed, when this prophecy was written, they were still without a native head, and many of them were in voluntary or involuntary exile. The next line, therefore, is true to the facts, whether it be rendered, *they wandered because there was*, or better, *they wander because there is, no shepherd*, that is, no king. *Cf.* Ez. $34^{5\,f.}$.

3. The term *shepherd* is a familiar figure for a ruler in the Old Testament.* In the preceding verse it denoted a Hebrew king. See also Je. $23^{1\,ff.}$ 50^{6} Ez. $34^{1\,ff.}$. In Is. 44^{28}, however, Yahweh is represented as applying it to Cyrus, and in Je. $25^{32\,ff.}$ and Na. 3^{18}. it is used of other foreign monarchs. Here also, since, according to v. ^{2}, the Jews have no king of their own, foreigners must be intended. Moreover, from what follows, it appears that they are not merely representatives of other nations, but the actual rulers of the Chosen People. If, therefore, the passage belongs to the Greek period, since the Jews during most of that period were subject either to the Ptolemies or to the Seleucids, the said shepherds must be the kings of Egypt, or Syria, or both of these empires. The *leaders*, lit., *he-goats*, whom Yahweh, in the next line, threatens to *punish* are the same persons under another name. *Cf.* Is. 14^{9}.—The reason for this outburst of divine wrath is plain. It is found in the clause, *for Yahweh will visit his flock*. The sufferings of his people have awakened a sympathy the expression of which means the overthrow of their oppressors. *Cf.* $1^{14\,f.}$ 8^{2}. The term *flock* is followed by an explanatory phrase, *the house of Judah*, which is clearly a mistaken gloss, being inconsistent with vv. $^{6\,f.}$, where Ephraim is the object of Yahweh's favour as well as Judah. *Cf.* also 9^{13}. It is both of these, now as timid and helpless as sheep, that *he will make like his lusty horse*, his war-horse, as described in Jb. $39^{19\,ff.}$. The phrase *in battle*, which is superfluous, seems to have been added by some one who feared that the allusion would not be understood. It speaks well for the insight of the author,

* The Assyrian kings called themselves shepherds. Thus Sennacherib gives himself the title *re'um itipešu, wise shepherd*. *KB.*, ii, 80 *ff*.

that, as Wellhausen remarks, "in the Maccabean war this prophecy was remarkably fulfilled."—**4.** The progress of this revelation of the purpose of Yahweh is interrupted by a pronouncement, in a different measure, which, moreover, has no particular fitness in this connection. It seems to have been suggested by the mention of the shepherds in v. [3]. At any rate, it has meaning on the supposition that these shepherds were, as has been explained, foreign rulers. From this point of view it is a variation on Je. $30^{20\,f.}$, where Yahweh first promises to punish the oppressors of Jacob, and then adds, "then shall his prince be of himself, and his ruler shall go forth from his midst." The scribe who penned the gloss, not content with repeating the simple language of Jeremiah, borrows a term from Is. 19^{13} and another from 22^{23} and produces this substitute, *From him*, Judah, *the corner*, *from him the peg*, the corner and the peg both meaning the king as the one who bears the responsibilities of government. *Cf.* Ju. 20^2 1 S. 14^{38}. It is the Messiah, according to the Targum, who is meant. *From him*, he adds, *is the bow for war*. This is usually interpreted as meaning military strength, but it is possible that the bow is here another figure for the king. Aben Ezra explains "the bow of Israel" in Ho. 1^5 as "the kingdom of Zechariah." This interpretation only increases the appropriateness of the final clause, *from him shall go forth all alike that rule.*—**5.** This verse attaches itself naturally to v. [3] and continues the subject there introduced, the wonderful effect of the presence of Yahweh among his people. There is some uncertainty about the text, but the general sense is easily understood. The hitherto peaceful and submissive will be more than a match for their oppressors. *They shall be like mighty men, trampling as it were the mire of the streets in battle*, that is, trampling their enemies like the mire of the streets. *Cf.* Mi. 7^{10}. They will not quail even before the dreaded cavalry of the powers arrayed against them, although they come as "a great company and a mighty army" (Ez. 38^{15}); but *they shall fight, because Yahweh is with them, and the riders on horses*, in which Egypt was strong as early as the time of Isaiah,* *shall be confounded.*

* *Cf.* Is. 31^1. In the battle of Raphia (217 B.C.) Ptolemy IV had 5,000 cavalry. *Cf.* Polybius, v, 79.

6. Attention has already been called to the generosity with which, in ch. 9, Ephraim is admitted to a share of the blessings promised to Judah and Jerusalem. *Cf.* 9[13]. Here the same disposition manifests itself, indicating that the prophecy as a whole is from the author of the one preceding. In this the thought is very nearly that of 9[13]. There Judah and Ephraim are the two parts of a weapon, "useless each without the other"; here Yahweh promises by his aid to make the northern tribes as strong and effective in his service as the southern. *I will make the house of Judah mighty*, he says; but he immediately adds, *and the house of Joseph will I deliver*, or, in view of the connection, *make victorious*. *Cf.* 9[9].

The name Joseph, when used as a collective, has more than one signification. In Gn. 49[22 ff.] and elsewhere it includes only the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. It is sometimes, however, owing to the prominence of these tribes, used to designate any coalition or confederation to which they belonged. Thus, in Ju. 1[22 ff.], it includes only Manasseh, Ephraim, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali and Dan; but in 2 S. 19[16 ff.] it comprehends also the tribe of Benjamin. It is not strange, therefore, to find it used, like Ephraim (v. [7]), sometimes, but rarely (7 t.) by the prophets, as a synonym for Israel in the narrower sense, that is, for the northern kingdom. It is doubtful if it is ever employed in any larger signification. *Cf. EB.*, art. *Joseph (Tribe)*.

The parallelism between the two lines is unmistakable. They therefore belong together; nor can they be separated without violence to the thought that the author intended to convey. This being the case, it is clear that the period which Wellhausen inserts after the first must be replaced by a comma. The relation between these two lines and the next is not so close as their connection with each other, but the natural inference is that, when Yahweh proceeds to say, *I will even restore them*, he does not mean Joseph alone,* but those of both branches of the Hebrew family who were wandering among the nations. Thus, there follows a revelation of the divine mercy in its real dimensions; of its breadth in the declaration, *I have compassion on them*, namely, Joseph as well as Judah, and of its depth in the promise, *they shall be as if I had not rejected them*. There is nothing in the term *reject* to forbid such an interpretation, for the overthrow of Judah was just as complete,

* So Mau., Hi., Köh., Brd., We., Now., *et al.*

for the time being, as that of Israel and the Jews interpreted their own misfortunes precisely as they did those of the sister kingdom.* All this is poetical and significant. The remaining clause, having neither of these characteristics, is doubtless a scribal addition, a reminiscence of Is. 41^{17}. Marti calls it "a theological catch-word." *Cf.* v. [8] Gn. 49^{18}.—**7.** The interpretation given to v. [6] is favoured by the fact that the writer now gives special attention to Israel. *Then*, he says, *shall Ephraim be like mighty men*, men who not only possess strength, but are conscious of its possession and delight in its exercise. *Cf.* Ps. $19^{6/5}$. *So shall their hearts rejoice as from wine.* *Cf.* Ju. 9^{13} Ps. 104^{15}, etc. *Their children* is sometimes interpreted as the equivalent of Ephraim;† but this can hardly be correct, for, although the author of this prophecy has not the originality of his great predecessors, it is too much to suppose that he would repeat the same thought three times in three successive lines with so slight variations. It is better, therefore, to take the phrase in its obvious sense, thus making the couplet of which it is a part express a desire natural to a Hebrew, and perfectly appropriate in this connection, that later generations may *see* in retrospect the great deeds that have been wrought through their fathers, and their hearts *exult in Yahweh*. *Cf.* Ps. $78^{4\,ff.}$ 79^{13} $102^{19/18}$, etc. —**8.** It has been noted as a characteristic of the author of this prophecy that he is apt to be carried away by his visions. The last verse furnishes an example of this peculiarity. In it the result steals a march on the process. The process, therefore, now comes lagging. Yahweh goes back to his promise in v. [6] and makes a new start. *I will shrill to them*, he explains, *and gather them;* summon them by a sharp, clear signal such as shepherds use in calling their flocks. *Cf.* Ju. 5^{16} Is. 5^{26} 7^{18}. They will respond in such numbers that *they shall be as many as they* ever *have been*.‡ These two declarations are separated, in the Massoretic text, by another "theological catch-word" for which there is neither room nor occasion.

* *Cf.* 2 K. $17^{19\,ff.}$ Ps. 43^2 $44^{10/9}$, etc. † So We., Marti.

‡ Two other renderings have been suggested: *they shall increase as they increased*, scil., in Egypt (Ki., *et al.*), and *they shall increase as they increase*, *i. e.*, indefinitely; but if the author had intended to express the former thought, he would have contrived to make it clearer, and if the second, he would have put the second vb. into the impf. to denote future time.

9. The exact meaning of the couplet that now follows it is difficult to determine. It is pretty plain that the text has suffered, but not so clear how it should be emended. At this point the question might arise whether it was possible to repatriate a people on whom the oft-repeated threat to "disperse them among the nations and scatter them in the countries"* had been but too literally fulfilled. It will be taken for granted that it did present itself, and that the words here found were intended to furnish an answer to it. On this hypothesis the first clause is most naturally rendered, *Though I scattered them among the nations*. The second should be a corresponding declaration. When, however, the rest of the verse is examined, there appear to be two such clauses, *even in far countries shall they remember me*, and *they shall rear their children and they* (the children) *shall return*, either of which will make sense with the foregoing, but only one of which can well be original. The choice between them must depend on their relative fitness for this connection. This being the case, there can be little doubt that the latter is the gloss, having apparently been added to adapt a promise intended for the prophet's contemporaries to the needs of a later generation.—**10.** Thus far the restoration has been presented only in outline. It remains to add the details that give to a picture its vividness and effectiveness. It is not necessary, however, to multiply these particulars. Hence, in the present instance, although the preceding verse gave the impression that the Hebrews were scattered among many, if not all nations, only two are now actually named as contributing to the multitude of exiles returning to their country. The first of these is Egypt. *I will bring them back*, says Yahweh, *from the land of Egypt*. The Egyptians more than once came into hostile contact with the Hebrews. The most notable of these instances are (1) the invasion of Palestine by Shishak (I), as he is called in the Old Testament, late in the tenth,† and the defeat of Josiah by Necho II at Megiddo, toward the end of the seventh century B.C.,‡ on both of which occasions many Hebrews must have been carried to Egypt as prisoners. Others, doubtless, had gone there voluntarily while the two countries were

* *Cf.* Ez. 5^{12}; also Lv. 26^{33} Dt. 4^{27} 28^{64} Ez. 5^{2} $12^{14\,f.}$ 20^{23} 22^{15}, etc.
† 1 K. $14^{25\,ff.}$; Petrie, *HE.*, iii, 233 *ff.*
‡ 2 K. $23^{29\,f.}$; Petrie, *HE.*, iii, 336.

at peace with each other, and especially when they were in alliance against Assyria or Babylonia. Many from the northern part of the country must have taken refuge in Egypt when the kingdom of Israel was overthrown. When Nebuchadrezzar finally crushed Judah the conquered fled thither in great numbers, the final remnant taking the prophet Jeremiah with them.* These last found refuge in Tahpanhes, the Greek Daphnæ, now Defneh, just within the border; but there were other colonies in various parts of the country.† From this time onward there was always a large and growing Jewish element in Egypt. It attained its greatest development and influence, as was shown in the Introduction, in the Greek period, when the Jews not only became leaders in commerce and the industries, but rose to the highest civil and military positions. It has also been noted, however, that under Ptolemy III the condition of the Jews, especially in Palestine, became much less fortunate, and that this is the period to which belongs the prophecy here recorded. It is not strange that at such a time some one should have been moved to preach a new and completer restoration than his people had hitherto experienced. The prophet not only expects to see his countrymen in Egypt brought home, but he puts into the mouth of Yahweh the additional promise, *from Assyria will I gather them*. At first sight the mention of Assyria seems to contradict the opinion above expressed with reference to the date of this prophecy; but the contradiction is only apparent. The name "Assyria," although, of course, it generally denotes the great empire whose latest capital was Nineveh, does not, in the Old Testament, always have this meaning. It is repeatedly used of the powers which one after another took Assyria's place in the history of the oriental world. Thus, in 2 K. 23^{29}, it must be interpreted as denoting Babylonia; for the Assyrian empire was overthrown before Necho II started on his ill-fated expedition. So also, according to Stade, in Je. 2^{18} Mi. 7^{12} La. 5^{6}. In the books of Ezra and Nehemiah not only *Assyria* (Ezr. 6^{22}), but *Babylonia* (Ezr. 5^{13} Ne. 13^{6}), is used for Persia. These and other less obvious examples show that *Assyria* and *Babylonia* were sometimes employed by Hebrew writers to designate the existing world-power, or its

* *Cf.* 2 K. 25^{26} Je. $43^{4\,ff.}$.

† *Cf.* Je. 43^{7} 44^{1}.

seat, without reference to their original signification.* This being the case, the reader is free to conclude on other evidence that this prophecy dates from the Greek period, and explain the term Assyria in this instance as meaning the empire of the Seleucids.† There were Hebrews in great numbers in this direction also, mostly the descendants of those whom the Assyrians and the Babylonians had carried away captive.‡ Later the Persians under Artaxerxes III, it will be remembered, had added their quota.§ The prophet does not try to picture the meeting between this great multitude and the one from the West. He might have applied to it the words of Isaiah (7^{19}) with reference to another invasion from the same quarters, "They shall come and settle, all of them, in the yawning water-courses, and in the clefts of the cliffs, and in all the thorn trees, and in all the pastures."** He has not done so, but he has left evidence of realising that such a gathering would tax the dimensions of Palestine by providing for an overflow; for this seems to be the meaning of the added words, a reminiscence of Je. 50^{19}, *and to the land of Gilead will I bring them until*, lit., *and, it shall not suffice for them*. *Cf.* Jos. 17^{16}. Gilead is here used, not strictly, to denote the territory between Moab and Bashan, that is, between the Arnon and the Yarmuk (Dt. $3^{10.\ 12}$ Je. 50^{19}, etc.), but in the larger sense including Bashan, that is, for the entire region east of the Jordan once occupied by the Hebrews. *Cf.* Jos. 22^{9} Ju. 10^{8} 20^{1}, etc. The Massoretic text has *Gilead and Lebanon*, but for metrical and other reasons the latter must be omitted.

11. The last verse supplied certain geographical details that made for definiteness. They suggest others that increase its vividness. Thus, the mention of Egypt recalls the wonderful works that Yahweh wrought in the sight of the fathers "in the field of Zoan." *Cf.* Ps. $78^{12.\ 43}$. The author has no more doubt than the one who wrote Is. $11^{15\,f.}$ that, if necessary, Yahweh will repeat these, or perform yet greater miracles, for the deliverance and restoration of his people. *Yea*, he says, *they shall pass through the*

* The same usage appears in the New Testament, where Babylon means Rome. *Cf.* Rev. 14^{8} 16^{19} 17^{5} $18^{2.\ 10.\ 21}$. So also, according to many, 1 Pe. 5^{13}.

† See also Is. $19^{23\,ff.}$ 27^{13} Ps. $83^{9/8}$, according to Stade.

‡ *Cf.* 2 K. 15^{29} 17^{6} 18^{11} $24^{14\,ff.}$ 25^{11}.

§ See pp. 264 *f.*

** *Cf.* also Ho. 11^{11} Mi. 7^{12}.

Egyptian sea, that is, the Red Sea, as did their fathers under Moses. A similar miracle will be performed for the benefit of those who have to cross the Euphrates. This great river, when the time comes, will not merely be "divided," the water being piled up on either hand "like a wall," but *all the depths thereof shall be dried up*.* In the Massoretic text the relation between the two lines just quoted is obscured by the intervention of another, which, however, is so clearly a gloss borrowed from 9^4 that it may unhesitatingly be neglected. The nations named could not be expected to acquiesce in the purpose of Yahweh. Like the Pharaoh of old, blinded by their pride, they will even presume to resist him. The restoration of the Hebrews, therefore, means their humiliation, if not their destruction. The sentence pronounced upon the first recalls familiar utterances of earlier prophets. The explanation is that the oriental world-power through the centuries remained so true to its original character that arraignments of it in its various manifestations naturally present the same features. This one condenses the substance of Isaiah's vivid description of the fate of Assyria ($10^{5\,ff.}$) and a successor's sarcastic portrayal of the fall of Babylon (Is. $14^{12\,ff.}$) into a single sentence. *The pride of Assyria*, here, as in the preceding verse, Syria, *shall be humbled*. In the parallel line it is predicted that *the sceptre of Egypt shall depart*, which is equivalent to saying that the country will cease to have an independent government. *Cf.* 9^5 Gn. 49^{10}.

12. The prophecy might have closed with v. [11], but does not, for, as a glance at 11^{1-3} will show, those verses continue the same subject. They are a lament over the powers whose doom has just been pronounced, which, of course, should immediately follow the announcement of their destruction. This verse, therefore, must be an interpolation.—**11^1.** The lament is highly figurative, but there can be little doubt about its interpretation. The cedar is a familiar figure for anything lofty, while the oak is a symbol of greatness and strength.† In Is. $10^{33\,f.}$ the cedar represents Assyria. Ezekiel adopts the figure and in ch. 31 applies it in a much more

* This is only a less direct exhortation to courage and fortitude than the words of Judas Maccabæus to his men just before the battle of Emmaus, "Remember how our fathers were delivered in the Red Sea, when Pharaoh pursued them with an army." 1 Mac. 4^9.

† *Cf.* Am. 2^9 Is. 2^{13}, etc.

elaborate form to Egypt.* In the first lines of this lament, *Open, Lebanon, thy doors, That the fire may devour thy cedars*, the use of the plural for the trees permits, if it does not require, the reader to suppose that both Egypt and Assyria are included. They will disappear, as even these gigantic trees must when fire invades the forest. *Cf.* Is. $9^{17/18}$ Ps. 83^{14}.—**2.** The next couplet immediately arouses suspicion with reference to its genuineness. The cypress (*Cupressus sempervirens*), which is still "found in abundance in Lebanon and anti-Lebanon," is repeatedly mentioned in the Old Testament with the cedar; so often that, in certain connections, its appearance may be expected.

There is difference of opinion with reference to the tree here intended. It has also been identified with a variety of the pine (*pin. halepensis;* Tristram, *NHB.*, 353 *f.*), and the juniper (*Juniperus excelsa*, *DB.*, art. *Fir*). Neither of these, however, seems so likely to have been meant as the cypress, for the following reasons: (1) The word here used is generally so rendered in 𝔖, and oftener so than in any other way in 𝔊. (2) The cypress is more valuable than any of its rivals for the purposes for which the tree here named was used by the Hebrews; viz., for floors (1 K. 6^{15}), wainscots (2 Ch. 3^{5}) and doors (1 K. 6^{34}). So Post, *DB.*, art. *Fir*. The only alternative to the adoption of this view, apparently, is to suppose that the name here used, Ass. *burašu*, was sometimes loosely applied to more than one of the trees above enumerated.

Here, however, it is hardly in place. (1) The cypress, although it is associated with the cedar, is never in the Old Testament represented as a peer of the latter. It is called the "choice cypress" and admired for its foliage rather than for its grandeur. *Cf.* Is. 37^{24} Ez. 31^{8}. It ought not, therefore, to appear as the chief mourner for its stately neighbour, taking precedence of the more stalwart oak. (2) Indeed, it ought not to appear at all. If the cedar had been felled with the axe, the woodman might have spared the humbler tree, but fire makes no such distinction. *Cf.* Is. $9^{17/18}$. It is therefore an inconsistency, after throwing open the doors of Lebanon to this destructive element, to call upon the *cypress*, not, be it observed, the cypresses, to *wail* because *the cedar hath fallen*. The mourners, if there are any, must be sought beyond the reach of the flames. These and other considerations warrant one in

* In 𝔐 Ez. 31^{3} has "Lo, Assyria a cedar"; but, since the whole chapter is addressed to the king of Egypt, and the figure in its entirety is applied to him, the other name is doubtless a mistaken gloss. So Toy, Siegfried, Kraetzschmar.

neglecting the line quoted, and with it the next, *that the lordly have been devastated*.* The omission of these lines is an improvement both from the metrical and from the exegetical stand-point. The measure is improved because without these lines vv. $^{1-3}$ fall naturally into two tetrastichs corresponding to those of ch. 10. More important is the light thrown on the next two lines by the close connection into which they are now brought with v. ^{1}. The *oaks of Bashan*, whose right it is, at once come to the front as mourners because *the lofty forest hath come down*. It is taken for granted that the fallen forest is that of the cedars of Lebanon. This inference is unavoidable. The only alternative is to suppose that the forest is that of Bashan; in other words, that the oaks of that region are summoned to lament their own destruction. If, however, the forest is that of Lebanon, and the trees in it represent the doomed kingdoms of Egypt and Syria, or their rulers, the oaks must be other great powers destined to survive, at least for the present, to witness the mighty act of Yahweh.†

3. The stanza found in vv. $^{1\,f.}$ is complete in itself. It seems to have been inspired by the passage from Ezekiel just cited. There follows another which has its parallel in Je. $25^{34\,ff.}$. It contains two pictures or parables, in the first of which the kings whom Yahweh has threatened to punish again appear as shepherds. *Cf.* 10^{3}. *Hark!* says the prophet, *the wail of the shepherds*, adding the reason for their grief. The Massoretic text says it touches their *glory*, but, since Je. 25^{36} has "pasture" and this is the word that is required to complete the sense, it is probable that the original was, *because their pasture hath been devastated*. Here, as the Targum correctly teaches, *pasture* is a figure for the countries governed by the kings pictured as shepherds. In the second parable the kings are represented as young lions. *Hark!* it says, *the roar of the young lions, because the pride of the Jordan hath been devastated*. The Jordan has two valleys, an outer and an inner. The latter is much narrower than the former, and so low that it is sometimes

* The adjective *lordly* is used of the cedar also in Ez. 17^{23}, where EV. has "goodly," and in Is. 10^{34}, where the original reading was either "Lebanon the lordly" or, as in 𝔊, "Lebanon with its lordly ones." So Cheyne.

† *Cf.* Ez. $31^{16\,f.}$; also 𝔗, which renders the last two lines, *Wail, rulers of the countries, for your strong realm hath been plundered*.

flooded by the river. This narrow, winding strip is naturally very fertile, and therefore produces an almost impenetrable mass of vegetation, *the pride*, luxuriance, *of the Jordan*, which is, and always has been, a covert for wild beasts. *Cf.* 12^{5}; Tristram, *NHB.*, 10 *f.*; GASm.$^{HG, 484 f.}$. Among them in ancient times were lions. *Cf.* Je. 49^{19} 50^{44}. It is these beasts, driven in terror from their lairs by fire or flood, and left without a refuge, that furnish the author with his second illustration. *Cf.* 25^{38}. No less desperate shall be the case of the kings of Egypt and Syria when Yahweh takes in hand to punish them.

1. שאלו] Bla., *et al.*, point this as a pf., but v. ^{2} shows that the persons who would then be the subjects of the vb., instead of appealing to Yahweh, consulted the diviners.—בעת מלקוש] A mistaken gloss, unnaturally restricting the original thought. The author wished to teach his people where to look for rain, not when it was most needed. It seems to have been suggested by Dt. 11^{14}, which 𝔊 copies verbatim. The measure permits no addition.—חזיזים] Van H. ingeniously suggests הַזִּיזִים, *the beasts.*—ומטר] Not necessary, גשם alone satisfying the requirements both of the sense and the measure. Marti, therefore, omits it. See, however, Jb. 37^{6}, where both words are used in the reverse order, also a similar expression in Is. 3^{13}.—להם] Marti, following 𝔖, rds. לכם, overlooking the fact that the second line is not a promise, but the statement of a truth, and the third a continuation of the same thought, the construction being changed by substituting the impf. for the prtc. on account of the distance of the second vb. from יהוה, its subject. *Cf.* Ges.$^{§ 118. 5. R. 7}$.—**2.** כי] Adversative. *Cf.* Mi. 6^{3}, etc.; Ges.$^{§ 163. 1. R.}$.—התרפים] Here, if nowhere else, a numerical plural. *Cf.* Ges.$^{§ 124. 1 (c)}$.—חזו] Accented on the penult to prevent the conjunction of two accented syllables.—וחלמות—ינחמון] Two reasons for suspecting the genuineness of these two lines have been given in the comments. Another is that they have no place in the metrical scheme of the author, a system of tetrastichs.—וחלמות] There is difference of opinion with reference to the relation of this word to those that follow. Many make it the subj., and השוא the obj., of ידברו. So 𝔙 𝔗, Dru., Rosenm., Hi., Ew., Pres., Sta., Kui., Now., GASm., *et al.* It is better, however, for several reasons, to make it the object of the vb. and השוא the gen. dependent on it: (1) This is the more natural construction. (2) It is favoured by the fact that השוא has the art., while וחלמות has none. (3) The vbs. ידברו and ינחמו naturally take a personal subj. The majority of the authorities, therefore, have adopted this construction. So 𝔊 𝔖, New., Mau., Burger, Köh., Klie., Ke.,

Hd., Pu., Or., Reu., Rub., We., Marti, *et al.*—ינחמו] Kenn. 4 ינאמו, according to We. "perhaps correctly." The vb. נאם, however, occurs only in Je. 23[31], and there as a denominative apparently coined for the occasion. Besides, We. himself thinks that the present reading also suits the connection.—על כן] Marti, recognising the division into tetrastichs and accepting וחלמות—ינחמו as genuine, is obliged to omit the rest of the verse as an accretion; mistakenly, for there are as good reasons for retaining these two lines as for omitting those he omits. (1) They are metrically correct. (2) The tenses used correspond to those of the first two lines of the verse. (3) They complete the thought with which the writer began and furnish him with a basis for the rest of his discourse. Note especially על כן and the catchword רעה. Although these last lines, as a whole, are genuine, there are two words about which there is room for doubt as to their correctness. The first is נסעו. It excites suspicion because, while it closely resembles words generally used in such connections, it is itself not perfectly appropriate. It denotes a deliberate departure from one place for another as on a march or journey. *Cf.* Nu. 33[3 ff.]. The word required is one that implies danger or violence. We. suggests נעו or יָנֻעוּ, from נוע, *wander*. So also Now. This is an improvement, but נִסְעֲרוּ, from סָעַר, *scatter* (7[14]), not only suits the connection, but furnishes a key to the origin of the present reading.—יענו] We. would om. the word, but the measure favours its retention. Marti rds. יֵעָנוּ, citing 𝔊, but καὶ ἐκακώθησαν = וַיֵּעָנוּ. GASm. rds. וַיָּנֻעוּ. This last, or, without the connective, יָנֻעוּ, would suit the connection. The same is true, however, of 𝔐, which, so far as the meaning of the word is concerned, is supported by the Vrss. It is interesting also to note that in Is. 54[11] the vbs. סער and ענה are associated.—**3.** חרה] The pf. with the force of a present tense. *Cf.* Ges. § 106. 2 (a).—אפקד] This vb., with על, denotes hostility, without it, friendliness. See the next clause; also Je. 23[2].—כי פקד] Perhaps an error for כי יפקד.—At this point van H., ignoring the indications from form and content that have been noted in the Introduction, inserts 11[1-17] and 13[7-9].—צבאות] Om. with Kenn. 17, although its equivalent appears in all the Vrss. So Marti, Kit.—את בית יהודה] An intrepretative gloss, as prosaic as it is unnecessary. *Cf.* 1[7] Is. 7[17] 8[a]. So We., Now., Marti., Kit.—כמלחמה] Perhaps, as Marti conjectures, a loan from v. [5].—**4.** The reasons for rejecting this verse have been given in the comments. Marti makes a tetrastich of it, but only by disregarding the length of the lines.—ממנו] The antecedent is Judah. 𝔖 has the pl. of the pron. here as in the last clause of v. [3].—יחדו] After a sg., which, however, has a collective signification. Cp. Marti, who would transfer this word to v.[5] in place of והיו.—והיו] 𝔖[L] oms. ו׳, but not 𝔖[AU]. Marti's idea is that the insertion of this word was rendered necessary by a mistake in

punctuation which made יחדו a part of v. ^{4}; but (1) יחדו would not take the place of והיו, which, moreover (2), is precisely in the style of the original author. *Cf.* vv. $^{6.\,8}$.—כגברים] For 'כ We. rds. 'ב, rendering the whole clause, ***and they shall tread on heroes.*** Similarly, Now., Marti, GASm., Kit. (The last has by mistake 'בג for 'ובג). This, however, is inadmissible. If the author had intended to say what is attributed to him, he would either have placed בוסים before כגברים or גברים before the proper form of היה. Moreover, he would probably have made the noun a direct obj., this being the construction elsewhere used after בוס. *Cf.* Is. 63^{6} Ps. 64^{14}, etc. In Ez. 16$^{6.\,22}$ the ב is locative. *Cf.* BDB. 𝔐 makes sense if, with 6 Kenn. mss. and the critics just cited, for בטיט one reads כטיט and translates it *as it were mire.*—בוסים] For בָּסִים, like קוּמִים, 2 K. 16^{7}, and לוּט, Is. 25^{7}. *Cf.* Ges. § 72. 7. R. 1.—והבישו]. *Cf.* 9^{5}.

6. והושבותים] It is a Jewish conceit that this is a composite form representing both שׁוב and ישׁב in Hiph., as used in Je. 32^{37}, and meaning both ***return to***, and ***reinstate in***, Palestine. So AE., Abar., Ki., Dru., Rosenm., Pu., *et al.* The truth probably is that there were two readings and that the Massoretic text resulted from the inability of the scribes to decide which was the correct one. The great majority of the mss. collated by Kenn. have this mongrel form, but 6 have והשׁבתים, which is ambiguous, and 25 והושׁבתים, Hiph. from ישׁב. This latter is the one preferred by 𝔊, Ra., Bla., Mau., Klie., Ke., Hd., Ols., Pres., Pu., *et al.*; but, as Köh. observes, if the writer had intended to use the Hiph. of ישׁב, he would naturally have added a phrase telling how or where they were to dwell. *Cf.* Je. 32^{37} Ez. 28^{26}. The omission of any such phrase makes it probable that here, as in v. ^{10}, it was the Hiph. of שׁוב that he intended to use. So 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, New., Ew., Hi., Köh., Brd., Or., Wri., Sta., We., Kui., Now., Marti., GASm., Kit., *et al.* If the original was והשׁבתים, as it is in five of the other eight instances in which the Hiph. of שׁוב is used, this form would naturally be understood differently by different readers, and the zeal of the parties thus arising would soon find expression in the text.—זנחתים] The pf. in the sense of a plupf. in a supposition contrary to fact. *Cf.* Ges. § 106. 4; Dr. § 18. —כי אני וג'] These remaining words constitute an entirely independent sentence, like the similar clause in v. ^{3} a superfluous afterthought by a pious reader, metrically discordant with the preceding lines. *Cf.* also 12$^{5.\,8}$.—**7.** והיו] The pl. with a collective subj. *Cf.* Ges. § 145. 2 (*a*).—כגבור] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, כגבורים.—כמו יין] The Heb. regularly uses כ where the English idiom requires *as* with a prep. *Cf.* 12^{7}; BDB., art. כ, *fin.*; Ges. § 118. 6 (*d*).—יגל] This word is pointed as a juss. and interpreted as implying subjective interest. *Cf.* Dr. § 60 (*a*). It is better, since 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 have a connective, to rd. וגל.—**8.** ואקבצם] The impf. with the simple ו after another impf. is comparatively rare, be-

ing, as a rule, used only "when it is desired to lay some particular stress on the vb." or "in order to combine synonyms." Dr. § 134. Here the intention seems to be to emphasise the personality of the subj.—כי פריתים] An interpolation. *Cf.* v. ^{6}.—רבו] Kuiper rds. ארבה.

9. ואזרעם] This word, as pointed, contradicts the promise of the preceding verse. What the author wishes to say is evidently, *Though I have scattered them.* When, however, the impf. is used of past action, a preceding ו usually takes the form of ו consec. Here, therefore, if the vb. is correct, the reading should be וָאזרעם. So Bla., Marti, Kit. But the correctness of the vb. is questioned. It is not elsewhere used in the sense of *scatter* of human beings. The word זרה is the one regularly used in that signification. See esp. Ez. 20^{23} 22^{15} 29^{12} 30^{23}, where it occurs in the phrase "scatter in the lands," and Ps. $44^{12/12}$, where the dispersion is described as "among the nations." Perhaps, therefore, the original reading, as We. suggests, was וָאזרם. So Now., GASm.—ובמרחקים יזכרוני] Marti oms. these words. It is not they, however, but the remaining four, that have been added. On the ו of ובמרחקים, see Ges. § 154. note (b).—וחיו] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, וְחִיּוּ. So Seck., New., Sta., We., Now., Marti, Kit.—ולבנון] One reason, the metrical, for considering this word a gloss has been given in the comments. There are others: (2) The region of Lebanon, if it had been in the mind of the author, being a part of western Palestine, did not need to be mentioned. (3) The presence of the word in the text can be explained as a reminiscence of Dt. 3^{25} or Je. 22^{6}.—ימצא]. The subj. is a pron. referring to ארץ. *Cf.* Jos. 17^{16}.

11. ועבר] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔗, ועברו, the subj. being the returning exiles. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—בים צרה] 𝔊, ἐν θαλάσσῃ στενῇ; 𝔗, *per mare angustum.* The phrase has given rise to many and various opinions. The word צרה has been treated as a proper name (Hi.); a substantive meaning *trouble* or *adversary*, used independently (Köh.) or as the subj. of עבר (Ki.), or an appositive to ים (Ke.), or a gen. with ים (RV.), or an acc. denoting limit of motion (de D.), or an adverbial acc. (AV.); a vb. with the sense of *cleave* (Hd.). Others have attempted to emend the text. Thus Bla. rds. צֹרָה, *to Tyre;* also Klo., Sta. This reading, however, is probably older than Bla., for it seems to have suggested the gloss that follows. These attempts to construe or emend the passage having proven unsatisfactory, modern critics have returned to Secker's conjecture, that here, as in Is. 11^{11} the text should read בים מצרים. So We., Kui., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit.—והכה בים גלים] The secondary character of this clause is evident. (1) It requires an awkward change of subj. (2) It separates two lines that belong together. (3) It adds a fifth line to an already complete stanza. (4) It is easily explained as a loan from 9^{4}, suggested by צרה, in which the scribe who inserted it found the

name of Tyre.—והביש] We., taking for granted the genuineness of the preceding clause, rds., with Kenn. 96, 𝔊^L, והביש; but if that line be omitted there will be no need of changing this or either of the following vbs. This one is explained as a Hiph. used in the sense of Qal. *Cf.* BDB.—יאר] Generally the Nile, but in the pl. sometimes streams other than the branches of that river. *Cf.* 33^{21} Jb. 28^{10}. Moreover, in Dn. $12^{5\,ff.}$ it is used of the Tigris. The context, with its regular alternations between Egypt and Syria, makes it probable that it here means the Euphrates, or is an error for הנהר, the usual designation for that river. *Cf.* Gn. 31^{21}, etc. The mistake would be a natural one after the allusion in the first line to the passage of the Red Sea.—**12.** This whole verse is evidently an accretion. (1) It breaks with the metrical scheme of the rest of the chapter. (2) It disturbs the connection between v. ^{11} and 11^{1}. (3) It is clumsy and confusing in its style compared with the preceding verses. The last point holds even if, for וגברתים, one read, with We., *et al.*, וּגְבֻרָתָם, *and their might.*—ביהוה] 𝔊 𝔗 add *their God.*—יתהלכו] Rd., with Kenn. 150 and 𝔊 𝔖, יתהללו. So Bla., New., We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**11^{1}.** בארזיך] The prep. denotes that the action of the vb. will be unrestricted; the fire will devour at will among the cedars. *Cf.* Ges. § 119. 2 (b) (c).—**2.** The first half of the verse, as shown in the comments, betrays its ungenuineness by its content. It is also metrically inadmissible. (1) It separates two couplets that are more closely related to each other than either of them is to it. (2) It makes the stanza in which it is found just so much longer than the others. The phraseology betrays dependence on v. ^{1}.—אשר] Causal. *Cf.* Ho. 14^{4}. Ges. § 158.—בשן] Usually with the art., which is here omitted, although the noun is a vocative.—הבצור] Qr., with many mss., הבציר. The art. is sometimes found with an attributive adj. when the noun has none. *Cf.* 4^{7} 14^{10}, etc.; Ges. § 126. 5. R. (a); Dr. § 209.—**3.** קול] With the force of *hark*. *Cf.* Ges. § 146. 1. R. 1.—יללת] On the composite *shewa*, see Ges. § 10. 2. R. A (a).—אדרתם] Rd. מרעיתם, as in Je. 25^{36}. —הירדן] Always with the art. in prose, and only twice (Ps. $42^{7/6}$ Jb. 40^{23}) without it in poetry.

d. The two shepherds (11^{4-17} 13^{7-9}).

The section naturally divides itself into two paragraphs, the first of which deals with

(1) *The careless shepherd* (11^{4-14}).—The prophet represents himself as directed by Yahweh to take charge of a flock of sheep that are being reared for the market. He does so, but finally tires of his duties and asks to be dismissed; breaking one of the symbolic

staves with which he has provided himself when he leaves the sheep, and the other when he receives his wages and deposits them in the temple treasury. The story is more complete in its details than that of $6^{9\,ff.}$, but the absence of definite persons and places and the neglect of the author to keep his narrative throughout distinct from the ideas symbolised indicate that, whatever one may think of the other case, one has here to do with a parable. *Cf.* Ez. $4^{1\,ff.}$ $5^{1\,ff.}$ $12^{12\,ff.}$.

4. The interpretation of the story as a parable does not deprive the introductory statement, *Thus saith Yahweh*, of significance. The author would doubtless have claimed that, although Yahweh did not actually command him to perform the acts described, the teaching of the parable had the divine sanction. The addition *to me* indicates that this was his conviction. *Cf.* Is. 8^{11} 18^{4}, etc. Yahweh instructs the prophet to *feed*, act in the capacity of a shepherd to, *the flock for slaughter*. *Cf.* Je. 12^{3}. Too much stress cannot be laid upon the fact that the sheep are destined for the shambles. This seems to have been ignored by those who find here a representation of a good shepherd, whether Yahweh (Stade) or a humane high priest (Wellhausen). It is clear from v. ^{6}, where the term *shepherd* is a synonym for *king*, that the command here given requires the prophet to personate a king and illustrate the character of his government. Who the king is, the author is careful not to explain, but, as shown in the Introduction (256), the indications point to Ptolemy III, king of Egypt from 247 to 222 B.C. It is clear from vv. $^{15\,f.}$ that he is the first of two rulers portrayed by the same hand. He must therefore have ceased to rule before this and the next ten verses were written. In other words, this passage, like Dn. 11^{2}–12^{4}, is not so much prophecy as history.

5. This king is not himself accused of destroying his own sheep. It is *they that buy them* who *slay* them. The terms here used are best explained as applying to the method of collecting the taxes in Palestine from the time of Ptolemy III onward. The Jews had previously had little reason to complain in this matter. When, however, Joseph, a disreputable nephew of the high priest Onias II, by cunning and bribery secured the franchise, it became an instrument of cruelty as well as a source of enormous profit to its

possessor and his subordinates, who literally bought and sold the people without mercy. They could slay *uncondemned*, that is, without incurring guilt or feeling remorse for their cruelty. *Cf.* Je. 50$^{6 f.}$. It must be the same—who, moreover, are Jews; otherwise they would not use the language attributed to them—*that sell them*, saying in their conceit and hypocrisy, *Blessed be Yahweh that I am rich! Cf.* Ho. 12$^{7 f.}$. Meanwhile, *their shepherd* (not, as the word is usually rendered, *shepherds*), the king whom the prophet represents, *hath no compassion on them*, affords them no protection. This is precisely what one would expect from that "remarkable king" Ptolemy III, who, as Mahaffy puts it,* changed "from a successful warrior into a good-natured, but lazy, patron of politicians, of priests, and of pedants."—**6.** This verse is treated as a gloss by some of the later critics, but that is because they have misunderstood the context. If the interpretation above given to vv. $^{4 f.}$ be adopted, it will not be necessary to resort to excision. The prophet has been directed to play the part of a shepherd who, though careless and unworthy of his office, has his place in the divine plan. The present purpose of Yahweh is here revealed. *I will no longer spare the inhabitants of the earth*, he says, *but lo, I will deliver men, each into the hand of his shepherd* (not *his neighbour*), *and into the hand of his king*. The scenes enacted in Palestine are to be repeated under other rulers in other parts of the earth, until *they*, these kings, *shall crush the earth*, allow ruin to overtake their lands. All this Yahweh will, for the present, permit. *I will not*, he declares, *rescue from their*, these kings', *hands*. In the East as well as in the West the people had long been the sport and the prey of their rulers.

7. These were the prophet's instructions. He proceeded, according to his narrative, to execute them. *So I fed*, he says, *the flock*, the flock destined *for slaughter*. The Massoretic text of the rest of this clause is unintelligible, but it is clear from the Greek Version that the original reading was, *for the traders in sheep*, these traders being the heartless buyers and sellers who, as above described, make a business of killing the sheep. The prophet had the usual implements of a shepherd, among which was a staff such

* *HE.*, iv, 124.

as David carried. *Cf.* 1 S. 17^{40}. Indeed, he had *two staves*. To these he gave symbolic names, calling *the one Delight, and the other Bonds*. The symbolic use of these staves seems to have been suggested by Ezekiel's parable of the two sticks. *Cf.* $37^{15 ff.}$. In this case, in spite of later explanations, the meaning is not easily discoverable. In seeking it one must keep constantly in mind that the prophet, as a shepherd, represents, not Yahweh, but an earthly king. This being admitted, the two staves will naturally symbolise the duties or relations of a shepherd to his flock, and, in the higher sphere, of a ruler to his people, or the conditions that result from the observance of such relations. Now the ideal attitude of a king toward his subjects, as of a shepherd toward his sheep, is one of benevolent solicitude for their welfare, and every king, when he accepts his crown, explicitly or implicitly obligates himself, so long as his subjects remain loyal to him, to devote himself to their best interests. The first staff, therefore, is called *Delight*, a name which, in the light of Ps. 90^{17} and Pr. 24^{25}, may be interpreted as denoting the pleasure that accompanies well-being. The breaking of this staff, according to v. ^{10}, is therefore fitly represented as equivalent to the repudiation of a covenant guaranteeing the bestowment of the blessings by which the pleasure was induced. Secondly, it is the duty of a ruler not only to maintain toward those under his authority a disposition and attitude that will promote their happiness, but also to provide that their relations with one another shall be such as contribute to the same result. He must bind them into a harmonious whole; otherwise his own efforts to benefit them may arouse discontent and jealousy issuing in the most serious internal disturbances. This seems to have been the thought of the prophet in naming his second staff *Bonds*, that is, Unity. At any rate, this is in harmony with what he says, in v. ^{14}, that he meant by finally breaking it. Note, however, that the staves symbolise simply ideals or obligations. Moreover, the act of taking them has a restricted significance. It cannot mean that the prophet, as a shepherd, fulfilled the requirements of his office. The sequel shows that, although he recognised his obligations, he neglected them; and this thought must be supplied when he repeats that he *fed*, took charge of, *the flock*.

8. There should now at once follow an account of the prophet's experience as a careless shepherd. It is postponed to make room for a statement that immediately challenges attention and examination, *I destroyed the three shepherds in one month.* The use of the article often implies knowledge on the part of the reader which will enable him to identify the persons or objects mentioned without further description. Hence Wellhausen argues that these shepherds must have been introduced in a passage connecting this verse with the one preceding which has been lost. Moreover, since there seems to be as little connection between the statement quoted and what follows, he supposes that there is another lacuna at this point. This hypothesis is illogical and unnecessary. The natural inference from the fact that the statement in question has no connection with either the preceding or the following context is that it is an interpolation, and this inference is confirmed by other considerations. For example, the object of the parable, as already explained, was to picture conditions as they were not long before it was written. From v. [6] it appears that these conditions were in accord with the divine purpose for the time being. The author cannot, therefore, have represented Yahweh, who must be the "I" of the sentence, as destroying three other shepherds presumably for the same offence that he himself was instructed to commit.* It is much more probable that the statement is a gloss by some one who thought he saw mirrored in the parable a time when three rulers one after another in rapid succession were removed. The opinions with reference to these rulers are many and various. The latest exegetes incline to identify them with certain high priests of the period just preceding the Maccabean uprising; for example, Jason, Lysimachus, and Menelaus. *Cf.* 2 Mac. 4[7 ff. 23 ff. 29 ff.].

So Rub., Marti. This is only one of many different conjectures on the subject. Rub. enumerates twenty-five. There are at least forty, together covering the whole field of Hebrew history from the Exodus to the conquest of Palestine by the Romans, and including most of the men and institutions therein of any importance. Indeed, some have sought these three shepherds outside of the Holy Land. The following specimens will indicate how wide is the divergence on the subject. The three are identified with Moses, Aaron,

* This objection is valid, whether the clause be left where it is or, as Marti suggests, placed after v. [7a].

and Miriam; Jer., *et al.*: with Zechariah, Shallum and another, perhaps Menahem; Mau., Hi., Ew., *et al.*: with Judas Maccabæus and his brothers Jonathan and Simon; Abar., *et al.*: with the kings, priests, and prophets of the Hebrews; Theodoret, *et al.*: with the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes; Lightfoot, *et al.*: with Assyria, Babylonia, and Persia; Klie., *et al.* Of course, most of these conjectures would not have been proposed if their authors had not first persuaded themselves that a month might mean any length of time from a few days to 210 years.

Since, however, the interpolator must have seen that throughout the parable the shepherd represents a king, he would naturally use the term in the same sense. The three shepherds are therefore doubtless three kings, and since this gloss is later than the original parable, presumably kings of Syria. If so, it is probable that they are the three who, according to Dn. 7^8, were "plucked up" —according to v. [24] of the same chapter they were "put down"— by Antiochus Epiphanes, and who are plausibly identified with Seleucus IV, Heliodorus, a usurper, and Demetrius Soter, son of Seleucus and rightful heir to the throne, whom Antiochus Epiphanes superseded. Perhaps, however, since Demetrius not only was not destroyed, but finally succeeded to the throne, the three are Antiochus III, Seleucus IV, and Heliodorus. If it be objected that these three were not removed within a month, one may reply that although Seleucus ruled nine years, in Dn. 11^{20} his reign is reckoned at "a few days," and, if the author of the gloss took the words literally, he could easily persuade himself that they all died within the given time.—The removal of this gloss clears the way for a natural and satisfactory interpretation of the rest of the verse. It is a confession by the shepherd that, although he had taken upon himself to nourish and protect the sheep committed to his charge, he *became impatient with them*, felt and showed a repugnance toward them not in harmony with his calling. Here, again, is unmistakable evidence that it is not Yahweh, or any other person or persons properly called good, whom the prophet is impersonating, but some one of a very different character, namely, a fallible and recreant human ruler.—The repugnance of the shepherd for his sheep naturally begot in them a corresponding feeling; *their souls*, he says, *also loathed me*.

9. The indifference of the shepherd shows itself in neglect of his

sheep. Indeed, he goes so far as to repudiate his duties toward them. *The one that is dying* of hunger or disease, he heartlessly declares, *shall die*, for aught he cares, and *the one that is being destroyed* by wild beasts or other foes *shall be destroyed*. These two clauses are a development of the last of v. [5] in the manner of Ezekiel's arraignment of the shepherds (kings) of Israel in $34^{2\,ff.}$. *Cf.* also Je. $15^{1\,f.}$. The last is a less apparent parallel to $34^{17\,ff.}$; but in it the author forgets his rôle and uses language that rather recalls Is. $9^{19/20}$. He is in reality describing the bitter struggle which, growing out of the rise of the Tobiads, rent the nobility in twain and brought untold evil upon the Jewish people. *They that are left*, he says, as if the struggle were still future, *shall devour, each the flesh of its fellow.*—**10.** The shepherd now brings forward the first of his staves, the one named *Delight*, symbol of the happy condition of a people under an ideal ruler. Since he has repudiated his obligations as a shepherd, it is fitting that he should *cut it asunder*, for nothing could better represent the abnormal relation between him and his charges and its unhappy consequences than such a severed and useless instrument. No formal explanation would seem to be necessary, yet he gives one, and, in so doing, adds a detail that deserves attention. It is found in the clause in which he describes the covenant now broken. *My covenant*, he calls it, again deserting his figure, *which I had made with all the peoples*. The words are usually understood as meaning a covenant by which the Jews were protected from other nations;* but this is not the interpretation that best harmonises with the main thought of the parable. The covenant, if represented by the staff, can only be a covenant with peoples represented by the sheep, and surely the Jews were among them. If, therefore, the shepherd represents Ptolemy III, one must infer that not only the Jews, but the peoples about them who were tributary to Egypt had just cause of complaint against him as a ruler. If so, it is not strange that a little later, when Antiochus the Great undertook the conquest of Egypt, he met with almost no opposition until he reached Gaza, the Phœnicians and the Philistines being as ready as the Jews for a change of masters.—**11.** The words *and it was broken in that day* should

* So Theod. Mops., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Köh., Ke., Hd., Burger, Brd., Pu., Or., We., Now., Marti, *et al.*

be attached to v. ^{10}, of which it is properly the conclusion. The rest of the verse is very realistic. The prophet, resuming his rôle, reports that, when *the traders in sheep who were watching*, or, as van Hoonacker ingeniously suggests, *had hired*, him saw him cut the staff asunder, they *knew that it was the word of Yahweh;* that the action performed correctly, and to their shame, represented existing conditions. This is so simple and natural a declaration that it suggests the question whether the prophet did not go through a pantomimic presentation of his message before he put it into writing.—**12.** The shepherd, although he has failed to meet the requirements of his office, presents a claim for wages. The usual interpretation makes him address himself to the flock. It would seem permissible if the Massoretic text of v. ^{11} were correct. If, however, as has been shown, it is not the sheep, but the traders in them, who are watching the prophet, the natural inference is that it is the latter to whom the next speech is addressed. This inference is confirmed by the fact that it is these traders, according to v. ^{7}, whom the prophet has been serving. They, then, are the persons whom he now approaches, rather hesitatingly, with the request, *If it be good in your eyes, give me my hire.* Then he practically confesses his unworthiness of any remuneration by adding, *but, if not, refrain.* The traders respond by paying him, not, apparently, according to a previous agreement, but according to their estimate of his value as a shepherd. *They weighed me*, he says, *my hire, thirty pieces*, that is, shekels, *of silver;* about £4 2*s* sterling, or $20 in American money, according to Ex. 21^{32} the price of a Hebrew slave. The meaning of these words does not at first appear. It is necessary to recall whom the shepherd represents, and whom the traders, to appreciate their significance. But, when this is done, and one realises that it is the king of Egypt who is appraised and the tax-gatherers of Syria who appraise him,* the passage becomes one of the best examples of sarcasm in the Old Testament.

13. There follows an episode which, on any interpretation of the parable as a whole, it is difficult to understand. In the first place, according to the present reading, it is not Yahweh, but the shepherd, who has been appraised; and, secondly, there is no dis-

* Kliefoth and others connect the amount of money paid with v. ^{8}, but, if v. ^{8a} is a gloss, the dependence, if there is any, must be on its side.

coverable reason why the money should be thrown to the potter in the temple or elsewhere. It is therefore pretty generally agreed that the text needs emendation, and, indeed, that the command addressed to the shepherd should read, *put it into the treasury, the noble price at which thou hast been valued by them.* The term *noble*, of course, is to be understood as ironical. The reference to *the treasury* or storehouse is not explicit enough to make it clear to the modern reader where the money is to be deposited. In the statement that follows, however, the omission is made good; for here the shepherd says that he *put* the silver *at the house of Yahweh into the treasury*, or, to put it more idiomatically, brought it to the house of Yahweh and put it into the treasury. There are several references to the treasury of the temple or its contents. *Cf.* Jos. 6^{24} I K. 14^{26} 2 K. 24^{13}, etc. It appears from 2 Mac. $3^{4\,ff.}$ that it was a depository for private as well as public funds. When, therefore, the shepherd is commanded to put his wages into the treasury, it by no means follows that they are to be devoted to Yahweh. It is more probable—and the irony of the command is increased by this interpretation—that they are to be placed there for security.

14. In the final verse, which is but loosely connected with those that precede, the shepherd tells how he disposed of his second staff, *Bonds*. It, also, he *cut asunder*, thus, as he explains, *sundering the brotherhood between Judah and Israel.* The names *Judah* and *Israel* are most frequently used of the two kingdoms into which after the time of Solomon the Hebrews were divided; but the later prophets sometimes employ them together as a comprehensive designation for the entire people. Thus, in Je. 23^{6} they are equivalent to "the seed of the house of Israel" of v. ^{8}. *Cf.* also Je. $31^{27\,ff.}$ Ez. $37^{19\,ff.}$, etc. The brotherhood of Judah and Israel in this sense would be the unity of purpose and effort among the Hebrews after the Exile, especially those that constituted the restored community in Palestine. Now, the most serious rupture of this unity occurred, as has already been observed, on the rise of the Tobiads, when there began a partisan struggle for the control of affairs that finally assumed the dimensions of a civil war. If, therefore, Ptolemy III is the shepherd of this parable, this rup-

ture, for which he was indirectly responsible, must be the one symbolised by cutting asunder the second staff. Thus the whole becomes a picture of conditions, especially in Palestine, just before that country ceased to belong to Egypt and became a part of the Syrian empire.

In Mt. $27^{9 f.}$ the Evangelist, referring to the purchase of the Potter's Field, says, "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken through Jeremiah the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was appraised, whom some of the sons of Israel appraised, and gave them for the Potter's Field as the Lord appointed me." The discussion of this quotation properly belongs in a commentary on the Gospel from which it is taken, but two or three points may here be noticed. In the first place, there should be no doubt that the Evangelist meant to refer to v. ^{13} of the parable above discussed, the divergence from the original being explained by the liberty he allowed himself in his quotations. *Cf.* Mt. 2^{23} 21^{5}. The appearance of the name of Jeremiah for that of Zechariah has received various explanations. Among them are the following: (1) That the name is an addition to the original text of the Gospel. (2) That the name of Jeremiah, or an abbreviation of it, has been substituted for that of Zechariah by a careless copyist. (3) That the name of Jeremiah, whose book once stood first among the prophets, is here a title for the whole collection. (4) That the words of Zechariah are based on Je. 18, and are therefore virtually the words of Jeremiah. These however, are only so many excuses for refusing to make the harmless admission that the Evangelist attributes to the greater and better known of two prophets words that belong to the other. See Mk. 1^{2}, where a passage from Malachi is attributed to Isaiah. Finally, the incident narrated in the Gospel is the fulfilment of the words of the prophet, not in the strict sense of being the event he had in mind as he wrote, but only in the loose sense of being an event by which the words of the prophet are recalled. *Cf.* Mt. $2^{15. 23}$, etc.

4. אלֹהי] 𝔊, *παντοκράτωρ* = צבאות; 𝔖^{LU} add [illegible]. Rd., with Kenn. 246 (now) אלי as in v. ^{15}.—ההרגה] A gen., the equivalent of an inf. of purpose. *Cf.* Is. 53^{7} Ps. 44^{23}, etc.; Ges. § 128. 2 (i) *An.*; Kö. § 336 t. 𝔖 has

ܡܬܗܡܠܐ; acc. to Sebök an error for ܡܬܗܡܟܠܐ.—**5.** קניהן] With a fem. pl. sf. because צאן is conceived as a collection of ewes. *Cf.* Je. 50^{17}.—יהרגן] For יהרגון, the reading of 25 Kenn. mss. The ן is the sf. of the 3 pl. fem.—יחמל, יאשמו] With *daghesh orthophonicum* to call attention to the silent *shewa* under the preceding guttural. See also אחמל v. ^{6}. *Cf.* Ges. § 13. 2 (b).—יאמר] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, יאמרו. So We., Now., Marti, Kit. The loss of the pl. ending is explained by the fact that in the clause quoted each of the subjs. speaks for himself.—יהוה] 𝔊^{A} adds *παντοκράτωρ*.—ואעשר] Qr., with 30 Kenn. mss., וַאְעְשִׁיר, by syncope for וַאֲעְשִׁיר. *Cf.* וַארני; Ges. § 19 (b). The Kt., however, with the pointing וְאֶעְשַׁר is defensible. *Cf.* Ho. $12^{9/8}$ Jb. 15^{29}. The ו has a circumstantial force. *Cf.* Gn. 18^{18} Ju. 16^{15}, etc.; Ges. § 142. 1 (b) R. 1. The Vrss. have the equivalent of either ונעשר (𝔊 𝔙) or והעשירנו (𝔖 𝔗).—רעיהם] Rd., with 18 mss. 𝔖 𝔗, רעיהן. So Bla., We., Now., Kit. It is not probable that the author, having taken pains to use the fem. sf. in קניהן, would so soon forget himself. See also עליהן. A copyist, however, might carelessly write the one for the other. The noun might be either sg. or pl., but, since the vb. of which it is the subj. is sg., it must be of the same number. *Cf.* Na. 3^{7}; Ges. §§ 91. 1. R. 1 (b); 93. 3. R. 3.—**6.** אנכי] The separate pron. instead of a sf. So v. ^{16} 12^{2}; with a sf., 13^{5}.—רעהו] Rd., as required by the parallel term, ***his king***, against the Vrss., רֹעֵהוּ. So Mich., Sta., We., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit.—מלכו] Van H., contrary to the context, rds. מַכָּרוֹ. —**7.** לכן עניי] Many and various attempts have been made to find in these words a meaning in harmony with the context, but both of them have been tortured in vain. The fact that כן reappears in v. ^{11} should have put any one acquainted with Heb. on the right track. Those who consulted the Vrss. had only to turn to 𝔊 to find in its reading *εἰς τὴν Χαναανῖτιν* or *εἰς τὴν γῆν Χανάαν* (L), a waymark to the original, viz., לִכְנַעֲנֵי. So Flügge, Bla., Burger, Rub., Klo., Sta., We., Kui., Now., Marti, GASm., Gins., Kit.—לְאַחַר] Not a cstr., but a sharpened form of the abs. used nominally. *Cf.* 2 S. 17^{22} Is. 27^{12}, etc.; Da. § 28. R. 2.—חֹבלים] There seems to be no object in insisting on the Massoretic vocalisation against the testimony of the Vrss.; 𝔊, *σχοίνισμα*; 𝔙, *funiculum*; 𝔖, ܚܒܠܐ; all of which favour חֲבָלִים. Whether it be rendered *Bonds*, or, more abstractly, *Union* or *Unity*, is not of consequence. On the use of the pl. as an abstract noun, see Ges. § 124. 1. R. (b).—וארעה את הצאן] This, at first sight, seems a useless repetition, but on closer examination it will be found to be a justifiable literary expedient. The first time *So I fed*, etc. looks backward to v. ^{4}; here it serves as an introduction to v. ^{8}.—**8.** ואכחר] Rd., with 20 Kenn. mss., ואכחיד.—בהם] The masc. for the fem. sf., because, as the writer proceeds, he loses sight of the figure. See נפשם, and in v. ^{9} בכם. —בחלה] ‘Απ., the מבחלב of Pr. 20^{21} being an error for מבהלת. Geiger rds. בעלה. citing Je. 3^{14} 31^{32}; but in 3^{14}, acc. to Gie., בעל has its usual sense, and in 31^{32} the original was געלה. Grätz suggests נִעֲלָה, but, since the

Syriac has preserved a derivative of בחל with the meaning *nauseated*, there seems to be no need of changing the text.

9. הַמֵּתָה] *Moritura;* so also the next prtc., while the third must be rendered *relictae*. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 116. 5}$.—אשׁה] Comp. the אִישׁ of v. ^{6}.—**10.** לְהָפִיר] Better לְהָפֵר, the oriental reading, found also in 28 Kenn. mss. It has circumstantial force, like the pres. prtc. in English. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 114. 2. R. 4}$.—כרתי] The pf. in the sense of the plupf. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 106. 1 (c)}$.—**11.** כֵּן עֲנִיֵּי] Rd., as in v. ^{7}, כְּנַעֲנִיֵּי.—השׁמרים] Van H. suggests הַשֹּׂכְרִים, which would make excellent sense.—אתי] The prtc., like the tenses, here takes a separate pronominal obj. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 116. 3}$.—**12.** הָבוּ] Always *milra'*, except in Jb. 6^{22}, where the preceding word is *mil'el* and the one following a monosyllable. The fem., הָבִי, is also naturally *milra'*. *Cf.* Ru. 3^{15}. On the other hand הָבָה is regularly *mil'el*. So at the beginning of a verse in Gn. 11^{7} Ex. 1^{10}, and when the preceding word is *mil'el* (Gn. 11^{3}); also when it is the first word in a speech, even if the preceding word is *milra'* (Gn. 11^{4} 1 S. 14^{41}). The only case in which it has a disjunctive is Gn. 11^{7}, and the only one in which it is itself *milra'* is Gn. 29^{21}, where, since the conditions are otherwise the same as in Gn. 11^{4} and 1 S. 14^{44}, the position of its accent is probably due to the following א. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 69. 2. R. 2}$. For the rules governing the accentuation in such cases, see Nrd. $^{§ 60 f.}$.—ואם לא] Elliptical condition. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 159. fin. R. 2}$.—חֲדָלוּ] In pause for חִדְלוּ.—כסף] Strictly an appositive of שְׁקָלִים understood. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§§ 131. 2 (c)}$; $^{134. 4}$.—**13.** הַשְׁלִיכֵהוּ] This word does not, as the ordinary rendering for it might suggest, imply contempt or any related emotion. See Gn. 21^{15}, where it should be translated *bestow*. The closest parallel to the present instance is found in 2 Ch. 24^{10}, where the author says that, in response to a proclamation of King Josiah, "all the princes and all the people gladly brought in" the required sum "and put it (וַיַּשְׁלִיכוּ) into the chest." *Cf.* Ju. 8^{25} 2 K. 4^{41}, etc.—היוצר] This word, as was observed in the comments, is unintelligible in this connection. Yet it is the reading that underlies 𝔊 Σ (τὸ χωνευτήριον), Aq. (τὸν πλάστην), and 𝔙 (*statuarium*); also the citation in Mt. 27^{10}, where the Evangelist reports that the money returned by Judas was given εἰς τὸν ἀγρὸν τοῦ κεραμέως. 𝔖, however, has ܒܝܬ ܓܙܐ = בֵּית הָאוֹצָר (Ne. 10^{39}) or simply הָאוֹצָר (Je. 38^{11}), *the treasury*, the reading actually found in Kenn. 530 at the end of the verse. Many have adopted the opinion that this was what the prophet intended to say, but they are not agreed on the origin of the present reading. Thus, Maurer claims that it is not the text, but the interpretation of it, that has suffered, הַיּוֹצֵר itself having the sense of *treasury;* while Eichhorn and others contend that the original reading was הַיּוֹצָר, and explain this as an Aramaism for האוצר. So also Hi., Ew., Bö., Sta., Eckardt, *et al.* The most probable view is that היוצר is simply a mistake for האוצר, a י having been carelessly substituted for an א and the vowel of the last syllable changed to that of the familiar word for *potter*. So Ort., Reu., Now., Marti,

GASm., Kit., *et al.* We. does not accuse the scribes of tampering with the text, but he says that "the incorrect reading may have been purposely retained that היוצר might be interpreted as meaning *potter*. If the 'rich wage' was not worthy of the shepherd, it certainly was too small for Yahweh and the sacred treasury." He also calls attention to traces of a dual interpretation of this passage in Mt. 27³ ff., where the chief priests decide not to put the money returned by Judas into "the treasury," but expend it for "the potter's field." For another example of confusion of א with י, see דויג for דואג in 1 S. 22^18. 22.—אדר היְקָר] For האדר היְקָר the gen. of a noun being used instead of the corresponding adj. *Cf.* 2 S. 12^30, etc.; Ges. § 128. 2 (f).—יקרתי] Since the subj. can hardly be the prophet (GASm.), rd. יקרתָ. So We., Now., Marti, Kit., van H.—שלשים] A numeral, whether before or after a definite noun with which it is in apposition, wants the art. *Cf.* Ges. § 134. 2. R. 2.—ואשליך אתו בית יהוה וג׳] *Constructio pregnans* for ואביא אתו בית יהוה ואשליך וג׳. *Cf.* Ges. § 119. 4. The noun בית, therefore, is in the acc. of the limit of motion with אביא understood. 𝔖 simplifies the sentence by transposing the phrases בית יהוה and אל האוצר and inserting the prep. ב before the former.—להפיר] Rd. להפר as in v. 10.—האחוה] 𝔊^B, τὴν κατάσχεσιν = האחזה; clearly an error. Most Greek mss. have τὴν διαθήκην.—ישראל] 𝔊^L, Ἰερουσαλήμ] An interesting reading which some recent critics are inclined to adopt. So We., Now., Marti, Kit. It can hardly be regarded as the original reading unless this passage can be shown to be by the same author as chs. 12 and 14.

(2) *A foolish shepherd* (11^15-17 13^7-9).—The prophet is here directed to assume the part of a foolish shepherd, whose treatment of his flock is briefly described. Then Yahweh breaks into a denunciation of the shepherd, followed by intimations concerning the process of purification by which his people must be prepared for final deliverance.

15. The words with which the prophet represents Yahweh as addressing him, *Take thee again the implements of a foolish shepherd*, might be interpreted as meaning that the shepherd now to be personated is the same as the one in the preceding paragraph; but this can hardly be the case. The change in tone that reveals itself in the succeeding verses is evidence to the contrary. The writer's idea would be more clearly expressed by a paraphrase; for example, Take thee again the implements of a shepherd, this time to play the part of a foolish one. Among these implements were

a staff (1 S. 17^{40}), a pouch (*ibid.*) and a pipe (Ju. 5^{16}).* The epithet *foolish* in the Old Testament generally implies moral obliquity. Thus, in Pr. 1^{7} the persons so described are said to "despise wisdom and instruction." What it means when applied to rulers is clear from Is. $19^{11 ff.}$, where, singularly enough, it is the princes of Egypt who are so characterised. The *foolish* ruler is one who is blind to the purposes of Yahweh, and helpless in the face of their fulfilment. The one here meant is probably Ptolemy IV (Philopator), who succeeded his father Euergetes in 222 B.C. His reputation is unmatched by that of any other member of the Ptolemaic dynasty. The Greek historian Polybius describes him as a drunken debauchee who was not only worthless as a ruler, but a constant menace to the prosperity and security of his country.† The Jews accused him of the worst excesses;‡ also of trying to force his way into the temple at Jerusalem,§ and, when he was frustrated, planning a wholesale massacre of their countrymen at Alexandria.** These charges, as Mahaffy believes, may be exaggerated, but even he admits that the king must have given the Jews cause to hate him,†† and that fact is sufficient to account for the tone of this passage.—**16.** Yahweh himself explains what is meant by the instructions given. *Lo, I will raise up a shepherd in the land.* The clause is predictive only in form. The verses that follow show that the writer is dealing with actual conditions. He does not repeat the adjective *foolish*, but substitutes for it a description of the administration of the reigning king. It is marked by negligence alternating with cruelty. The language used, which is consistently pastoral, is largely borrowed from Ez. $34^{3 f.}$. Here, however, only four cases are enumerated. First comes that of *the one that is being destroyed*, for example, by wild beasts. It the shepherd should, but *will not*, *visit* bringing assistance. The second is *the one that is wandering;* yet *he will not seek* it. The third is *the one that is maimed*, lit., *broken*, having met with an accident, perhaps, while scrambling over a rocky pasture.

* It is a ridiculous fancy of some of the commentators, ancient and modern, that the implements of this shepherd differed from those of the one in the other parable. So Cyr., Lowth, Moore, *et al.*

† *Hist.*, v, 34.
‡ 3 Mac. 2^{25}.
§ 3 Mac. $1^{10 ff.}$.
** 3 Mac. $3^{1 ff.}$.
†† *HE.*, iv, 145.

It *he will not* take the trouble to *heal*. The condition of the fourth is doubtful. The text reads *one that standeth*, perhaps *surviveth*. One would expect either *the one that starveth* or *the one that is hungry*, since the prophet completes the sentence by adding, *he will not nourish*, provide with food. The last clause, also, in its present form is only partially intelligible. The Syriac Version seems to have preserved the original reading, *the flesh of the fattest will he eat, and their legs will he gnaw;* a picture which excellently portrays the greedy policy Ptolemy IV appears to have followed toward the Jews. *Cf.* Ez. 34^{8}.

17. From this point onward the discourse is really predictive. The form, also, is changed, the remaining verses constituting a poem in four stanzas, each of which has three double lines. The prophet begins by pronouncing a *woe* upon the shepherd already described, who is now, however, called *my foolish shepherd*. On the pronoun, see 13^{7}. His offence is that he *leaveth the flock*. The instrumentality through which he, or rather the king he represents, is to be punished is the *sword*, that is, war. The verse is modelled after Je. $50^{35\,ff.}$, where another writer invokes the sword against the Chaldeans.* The writer seems also to have had in mind an oracle by Ezekiel against the ruler of Egypt in his time. "Son of man," that prophet represents Yahweh as saying to him, "I have broken the arm of Pharaoh, king of Egypt." *Cf.* Ez. 30^{21}. Here the reigning king (Ptolemy IV) is threatened with a blow *upon his arm*. The interpretation of the figure is found in Ez. 30^{22}. The arm of the king is smitten to "cause the sword to fall out of his hand," that is, to render him and his country defenceless against their enemies. Nor is this the extent of the penalty. Yahweh will smite with the same sword *his right eye*, this being another means of disabling men for service in war, since the loss of the right eye made a shield of little value. The result will be complete: *his arm shall wither away, and his right eye shall be utterly darkened*.—**13^{7}.** The reasons for connecting this and the next two verses with the eleventh chapter have been discussed in the Introduction. See pp. 253 *f.* The same subject is continued. Yahweh summons the *sword*,

* In Je. 50^{38} 𝔐 has חֹרֶב, *a drought*, but, as 𝔖 has the sword, and 𝔊 originally had the same reading, there can be little doubt that the Hebrew author wrote חֶרֶב.

with which he has just threatened the foolish shepherd, to *awake* and perform its office. *Cf.* Je. 47^{6}. Of the person against whom it is incited he now uses a Hebrew word that may be rendered, according to the vocalisation, either *my fellow* or *my shepherd;* but it is not difficult to decide in which of these two senses the author intended it to be taken. The former has in its favour the proximity of the synonymous expression, *my companion*. The latter, however, is preferred because, among other reasons, (1) the person in question is really the shepherd; and (2) without doubt is so called in this verse. There is no objection to the expression in itself, for in Is. 44^{28} Yahweh applies it to Cyrus, and, since the Hebrews believed that all rulers were under the control and direction of their God, they could apply it to a king, even if he were oppressing them instead of relieving them from oppression. Here the king of Egypt is so called by virtue of his office, because, in spite of his unworthiness, he is still in a sense a shepherd, and as such an associate of the Shepherd of Israel. This fact, however, does not protect him from deserved retribution, or, unfortunately, his subjects from the consequences of his unfaithfulness. *Smite the Shepherd*, says Yahweh, *and the sheep shall be scattered*. The sheep, of course, are the subjects of the recreant king, especially, as will appear, the Chosen People. *Cf.* Ez. $34^{5\,f.}$. *I will also*, Yahweh continues, *draw back my hand*, not, as some* have tried to show, to spare, but, as the preposition *against* clearly indicates, to smite, *the little ones*, the lambs of the flock, representing the lowly men and women as well as the children slain or dragged into slavery by a brutal soldiery. *Cf.* Je. 49^{20} 50^{45}.—**8.** The result to the Jews of this dreadful infliction will be that *throughout the land two-thirds* of them that are *in it shall be cut off and die*. The work might be accomplished in a brief time, perhaps in a single campaign. This, however, is not the author's idea. He makes Yahweh say that, after the greater part of the inhabitants have been destroyed or deported, the remainder must continue to suffer. Although *a third shall remain* in the land, this third will have to pass *through the fire;* fire being here, as often elsewhere in the Old Testament, a figure for affliction. *Cf.* 3^{2} Is. 43^{2}, etc.—**9.** Thus far there has

* So Mau., Ke., Hd., Pres., Wri., *et al.*

been no sign of mercy on the part of Yahweh for his suffering people. Now, however, it appears that the fire to which they are to be exposed is not the utterly destructive element of Ez. $15^{1\,ff.}$, but the purifying instrument of Ez. $22^{17\,ff.}$. *I will smelt them*, he says, abandoning his original figure for another, *as silver is smelted, and try them as gold is tried.** The desired result will follow; *they shall call upon my name, and I will answer them.*† Thus, as was promised in 10^{6}, they will be as if they had never been rejected. Then Yahweh will say, *They are my people, and they shall say, Yahweh, my God*. In other words, they will come from this furnace of affliction to renew the covenant Yahweh made with them when they escaped from Egypt.‡

The shepherd of the last three verses is by most exegetes identified with the Messiah.§ This interpretation is, of course, forbidden, if these verses are a continuation of ch. 11. It is not warranted by anything in them, even when taken by themselves, for the expressions *my shepherd* and *my companion* must be interpreted in the light of the context, from which it is clear that the person so designated is the object of Yahweh's indignation. The words quoted from v. ^{7} by Jesus,** therefore, were not in a strict sense—he does not say they were—fulfilled in his arrest and the dispersion of his disciples, but here again an incident suggests a passage of which it serves as an illustration.

15. כלי] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, כְּלֵי.—אולי] Here only; probably a copyist's mistake for אויל.—**16.** הנכחדות] Rd., with 4 Kenn. mss. 𝔊, הנכחדת, the sg. as in the co-ordinated cases. So We., Kui., Now., Marti, Kit.—נער] The word is certainly corrupt, but it is not so clear how it should be emended. Oort suggests הנדחת, the word used in a similar connection in Ez. 34^{4}, and 𝔊 (*τὸ ἐσκορπισμένον*) and 𝔙 (*dispersum*) favour this reading. So We., Now., Marti. An objection to it is that it does not sufficiently resemble נער to account for the substitution of the one for the other. The same objection cannot be made to הנעה, which suits the connection as well as the other and has the support of 𝔖 (ܡܘܙܥܐ) and 𝔗. (ראיטלטלו). So van H. Less attractive is הנעררת, one of the alternatives

* *Cf.* Is. 1^{25} 48^{10} Mal. $3^{2\,f.}$.
† *Cf.* Is. 58^{9} 65^{24} Je. 29^{11}, etc.
‡ *Cf.* Ho. $2^{25/23}$, but especially Ez. 16^{8} $37^{23.\,27}$.
§ So Jer., Cyr., Theodoret, Lu., Sanctius, à Lap., Dru., Marck, Dathe, Lowth, Burger, Ke., Klie., Hd., Wri., *et al.*
** Mt. 26^{31} Mk. 14^{27}.

suggested by Kit. The original, then, was probably הנעה, or, better, on the authority of 33 mss. 𝔊 𝔖, והנעה.—ירפא] 𝔖 adds ܣܘܟܝܢܐ ܘ ܠܒܫܐ, which, acc. to Sebök, is a duplicate rendering for the preceding clause.—הנצבה] Now. suggests הנחלה, but the context requires הרעבה, or an equivalent, with a connective.—ופרסיהן יפרק] Rd., with 𝔖, וכרעיהן יערק.—**17.** רעי] The word is usually explained as a cstr. with *i compaginis*. This explanation takes for granted that the next word is original in the text. There is room for doubt on this point. The expression used in v. [15] is רעה אולי or, better, רעה אויל. So Houb., Bla. Now, while it would be natural for the writer to vary his language to some extent, he would hardly abandon a thought that was the key-note of the prophecy. Nor did he, if the testimony of 𝔖 𝔗 is of any value, for they seem to have had a text with האויל. If, however, they had this reading, they must have had רעה for רעי, as have several mss., or, if they had the latter and ignored its form, the ending was neither *i compaginis*, nor, as some mss. and edd. point it, the termination of the cstr. pl., but the sf. of the first sg. as in 13^7. So We., Now., Marti, Kit., van H. It is possible that the original reading was רעה, and that it was changed to רעי through the influence of 13^7.—עזבי] The ending is not the termination of the cstr. pl., as 𝔊 understood it, and as it is pointed in some mss. and edd., but *i compaginis*. *Cf.* Ges. § 90. 3 (a). 𝔖 renders the word ܕܫܒܩܬ and oms. חרב, thus getting *to whose arm I have left the flock*.—חרב] Not חֹרֶב, *drought*, as Dru., Bla., Ort., Pres., Sta., Rub., Kui., *et al.*, point it; but, as in 𝔐, חֶרֶב, *sword*. (1) It is so rendered in 𝔊 𝔙 𝔗. (2) In 13^7, where this prophecy is continued, the sword is evidently intended. (3) In Je. 50^{38}, on which this passage is based, חֹרֶב, as has already been noted, must be an error for חֶרֶב. After this word יפל seems to have been lost.—**13^7.** עורי] With the accent on the ultima. *Cf.* 9^9; Ges. § 72. 7. R. 3.—רעי] Add to the reasons for retaining 𝔐 given in the comments that 9 Kenn. mss. have רועי.—עמיתי] Always elsewhere (11 t. in Lv.) concrete, and in Lv. 19^{17} clearly masc. Here, therefore, doubtless an appositive of גבר, the genus with the species. *Cf.* 1 K. 7^{14}, etc.; Ges. § 131. 2 (a); Kö. § 290 d.—נאם י׳ צ׳] An addition that disturbs the measure and, on the restoration of this and the following verses to their original place after 11^{17}, becomes superfluous. So Marti. Kit. removes the clause to the end of the verse,—where there is still less room for it.—הך] The word. is generally treated as an imv. It is so rendered in Vrss. If, however, it is an imv., it must be co-ordinate with עורי and should have the fem. ending. Since it has not the ending, and is followed by the pf. with ו, some have claimed that the original must have been אכה. *Cf.* Mt. 26^{31}. So, among the older exegetes, New., Bla., Hd., and among the later, We., Kui., Now., Marti, Kit. This is not entirely satisfactory. Perhaps for הך את one should read הכות, the inf. cstr. for the abs., as a substitute for the finite vb., as in 2 K. 3^{24}. *Cf.* Ges. §§ 75. 6. R. 15; 113. 4 (a). Note

that את is omitted before ידי.—ותפוצין] For ותפוצותיכם. On the form, see Ges. § 47. 3. R. 1 fin.; on the construction, 144. 1.—הצעירים] The word, with the Massoretic vocalisation, is ἅπ., and apparently indefensible. Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙, הַצֹּעֲרִים. 𝔊^AQΓ have τοὺς ποιμένας μικρούς, but ποιμένας is merely interpretive. So also the ܪ̈ܥܘܬܐ, *shepherds*, of 𝔖, and the חניניא, *underlings*, of 𝔗.—**8.** בכל הארץ] 𝔊^AQΓ, ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ; a mistake, since, with this reading בה would have no antecedent. 𝔊^L has both.—פי שנים] In Dt. 21^17 2 K. 2^9 *a double portion*, here *two-thirds;* construed as a collective.—יגועו] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, וגועו. Kit. omits.—והשלישית] With the art. because the third that is left is a definite portion.—יותר] The accent is thrown back before the following monosyllable. The original, however, was probably, as appears from v. 9a, יותרו. *Cf.* Ges. § 145. 2 (c).—**9.** את הכסף] Note the use of את, showing that the obj. of the inf., when a noun, is an acc.—הוא] The sg. for the pl.; perhaps a reminiscence of Ho. 2^25/23, where the antecedent is עם.—אמרתי] Rd., with Ho. 2^25/23 𝔊 𝔖 ואמרתי. So Marti, GASm., Gins., Kit.—יהוה] Wanting in some mss., but required by the construction. On the other hand, in Ho. 2^25/23, where אלהי is a voc., it is properly omitted.

2. *The future of Judah and Jerusalem* (12^1–13^6 14).

This division of the book of Zechariah has a title of its own. In the Massoretic text it reads, *An oracle of the word of Yahweh concerning Israel.* The subject, however, is not Israel, nor is the name so much as mentioned from this point to the end of the book. For this reason it is necessary to substitute for *Israel* the more suitable name *Jerusalem*, or better, for *concerning*, to read *to*, as in Mal. 1^1, thus making the title introduce a message to the Jewish world. There are two well-marked sections. The first deals with

a. THE JEWS IN THEIR INTERNAL RELATIONS (12^1–13^6).

This in turn may be subdivided into three paragraphs, the topic of the first being

(1) *A power in Palestine* (12^1-8).—The Jews in the strength of Yahweh triumph over their enemies, and dwell safely under his protection.

1. The paragraph opens with the briefest possible announcement of a divine oracle, *Saith Yahweh.* This is followed by a

couplet in the same style, and with substantially the same content, as Is. 42^{5}, *Who spread out heaven*, etc. *Cf.* Am. 4^{13} $5^{8\,f.}$. The object of such descriptions of the divine power is to impress the hearer or reader with the ability of Yahweh to do the thing promised or threatened. On the text, see the critical notes.—**2.** In this case it is a promise that has to be reinforced. *I will make Jerusalem a bowl to cause reeling*, says Yahweh, *to all the peoples round.* The figure by which wine is made to represent the wrath of Yahweh is a familiar one;* but in most cases nothing is made of the instrument by which Yahweh administers the draught. In Je. 51^{7}, however, Babylon is called "a golden cup in the hand of Yahweh." In this case it is Jerusalem through which he purposes to make drink of his wrath *all the peoples round.* The peoples the writer has in mind are so designated, not because they are gathered with hostile intent about the Jewish capital, but because they inhabit the regions adjacent to that which the Jews occupy. The picture here presented, therefore, is very like that of Is. 11^{14}, where it is promised that Judah and Ephraim united "shall pounce upon the shoulders of the Philistines," "despoil the children of the East," "lay hands upon Edom and Moab," and bring it to pass that "the sons of Ammon shall obey them." If, however, this was the thought of the author, it does not seem probable that he would immediately entertain the prospect of an extended siege of Jerusalem, or, if he did, would use the remaining words of the verse as ordinarily translated. Take, for example, the rendering of RV., *and upon* (marg. *against*) *Judah, also, shall it be in the siege against Jerusalem,* which, so far as it is at all intelligible, contradicts the context. Nor have the attempts to emend resulted in anything more satisfactory. A defensible rendering is suggested by 9^{14}, where Yahweh is represented as appearing *over* his people in battle. If the writer intended to express the same thought here, the clause should read, *over Judah will he* (Yahweh) *be in the siege against Jerusalem.* This translation, however, is satisfactory only, as will be explained, on the supposition that the whole clause is a gloss inserted by some

* *Cf.* Je. $25^{15\,ff.}$ Ez. $23^{31\,ff.}$ Hb. $2^{15\,f.}$, etc. The last passage has generally been misunderstood and employed as an argument against social drinking. We. translates it, "Woe to the one that giveth the others to drink from the cup of his wrath," etc.

one who thought, as many* have since done, that the situation is the same here as in ch. 14.†

3. The expression, *and it shall come to pass*, occurs no fewer than eleven times in this and the following chapters; four times‡ alone and seven times§ with the addition of *in that day*. The latter is used alone ten times; seven times** at the beginning and three times†† elsewhere in the sentence. The two together may therefore fairly be regarded as characteristic of these chapters. Here they introduce a second figure. Says Yahweh, *I will make Jerusalem a heavy stone to all the peoples*; the peoples being presumably the same as in the preceding verse. The application of the figure immediately follows: *All that lift on it shall tear themselves grievously*; which means that, just as one, handling a heavy stone, tears one's hands on its rugged surface, so shall they suffer who attempt violence on Jerusalem and its inhabitants. The verb here used occurs elsewhere only in Leviticus, and there only of the practice, forbidden by the Hebrew law, of mutilating the body in token of mourning. *Cf.* Lv. 19^{28} 21^{5}. This circumstance has led Nowack and others to question the genuineness of the clause; but unjustly, for (1) an injury resulting from a voluntary action can surely be said to be self-inflicted, and (2) the same word in Assyrian‡‡ is actually used to denote exposure to wounds in battle. There are, however, good reasons for suspecting the originality of the latter half of the verse, chief among which are: (1) that it is of the nature of a parenthesis; (2) that this is not the place for the statement made; and (3) that, like v.^{2} b, it produces a discord by anticipating the leading thought of ch. 14, a discord that is only increased by interpreting *there shall be gathered against it all the nations of the earth* as meaning that the stone in question is a weight, and that the figure is derived from the lifting contests which, when this passage was written, had recently been introduced at Jerusalem.

So We., Marti, *et al.* According to 2 Mac. 4^{12}, the high priest Jason, by permission of Antiochus Epiphanes, built a gymnasium and introduced Greek

* So Sta., Now., Marti, *et al.*

† For other glosses of like origin, see vv. $^{3.\ 4.\ 6}$.

‡ 13^{3} $14^{7.\ 16.\ 17}$.

§ $12^{3.\ 9}$ $13^{2.\ 4}$ $14^{6.\ 8.\ 13}$.

** $12^{4.\ 6.\ 8.\ 11}$ 13^{1} $14^{9.\ 20}$.

†† 12^{8} $14^{4.\ 21}$.

‡‡ *Cf.* Del., *Ass. Handwörterbuch*, art. *Šaṭâru*.

exercises at Jerusalem. *Cf.* Josephus, *Ant.*, xii, 5, 1. Jerome, commenting on this verse, says that in his day there was preserved "an old custom according to which, in the villages and towns and fortresses, round stones of great weight are provided on which the youths are accustomed to practice, raising the weight according to their strength, some to their knees, others to the navel, others to the shoulders and the head, but some, to display the greatness of their strength, with raised and joined hands over the head." In Athens, too, he says, he saw in the citadel near the statue of Athene a brass globe of great weight which he himself was not able to move.

4. The omission of the last clause of v. [3] relieves an exegetical difficulty, but it leaves the relations between the Jews and their neighbours unchanged. The latter are still hostile, but the former, with Yahweh to help them, are confident of deliverance in any emergency. He is more than a match for any force that can be brought against them. This is what is meant by representing him as defying the cavalry of the surrounding peoples. The thought is the same as that in 10^5, but the terms here used are borrowed from Dt. 28^{28}. He says, *I will smite every horse with terror, and its rider with madness.* The rest of the verse consists of two clauses, the first being in antithetic, while the second is in synonymous, parallelism with the one just quoted. The omission of one of them, so far from weakening, would decidedly strengthen the passage. Marti thinks it is the latter that has been added; but, if this were the case, would it not have been inserted next to the one it was intended to complete? This seems a reasonable view of the matter. Hence it is better to omit the parenthetical clause, *but upon the house of Judah will I open my eyes*, as an accretion, and thus bring the clauses before and after it into their natural relation.

5. The effect of this display of Yahweh's favouring power will be to inspire his people with renewed confidence in him. According to the Massoretic text it is the *chiefs* or *leaders* who give expression to this feeling; but, since in v. [6] the word so rendered should apparently be translated *families*, it is probable that the proper rendering for the first clause of this verse is, *Then shall the families of Judah say in their hearts.* These rural Jews, if there is strife and bitterness between them and the inhabitants of Jerusalem, as some have inferred from v. [2], ought to say something reflecting

unfavourably upon the latter. There is nothing of the kind. The speech they make, so far from indicating hostility, or even disrespect, seems the natural expression for admiration or sympathy. This is explained by the preceding verses. It is as if the author had said, When the Jews of the country see Jerusalem spreading confusion and misfortune among the surrounding peoples, they will recognise the hand of Yahweh in these results, and put the thought into words similar to those quoted, *There is strength for the inhabitants of Jerusalem in Yahweh of Hosts their God.* On the text, see the critical notes.—**6.** This reflection will react upon those who make it, and stimulate them to rivalry with their urban brethren. It will then be possible for Yahweh to use them, and that effectually, against their nearest adversaries. This thought is presented in a double figure, *I will make the families of Judah,* he says, *like a pan of fire among wood, and like a torch among bundled grain.* The second of these similes is one that appealed strongly to the Hebrews, for they knew what it meant when a fire was started during the dry season.* So destructive and troublesome will Jerusalem be to *all the peoples round.*† There follows a reminder of Is. $9^{19/20}$, *they shall devour to the right and to the left.* Meanwhile, *Jerusalem,*—and this clause seems to have been added to prevent the reader from suspecting the existence of any hostility between the city and the country,—untouched by the fierce struggle raging about it, *shall still abide in its place,* the inviolate and inviolable centre and stronghold of the Chosen People.‡

7 *f.* At this point there is a noticeable change in the form of discourse, which is carried through the next verse. Throughout these two verses the writer speaks, not for, but about Yahweh. This fact is taken by Marti as an indication of difference of authorship. But the same thing occurs four or five times in chs. 9 and 10,§ and Marti himself says in his comments on 10^{3} that "the change from the first to the third person should not excite surprise in the case of our prophet, who, without hesitation, sometimes introduces Yahweh as speaking and sometimes speaks in his own

* See Ex. $22^{5/6}$ Ju. $15^{4\,ff.}$ 2 S. 14^{30} Is. $10^{17\,f.}$.

† For other figures of like import, see Mi. $5^{7/8}$ Is. $41^{15\,f.}$.

‡ *Cf.* 14^{11} Jo. $4/3^{20}$.

§ *Cf.* $9^{7.\,14}$ $10^{3.\,6}$.

person." Nor does the content of these verses, as compared with that of the preceding context, warrant one in treating them as an addition to the original writing. True, some prominence is given to Judah in distinction from Jerusalem in v. [7]; but that is evidently due to an error in the Massoretic text, and it is neutralised in the next verse by special mention of the house of David and the inhabitants of the capital. It is not necessary, therefore, to adopt Marti's view of the authorship of the passage, or, if the last clause of v. [6] is an accretion, to suppose with him that v. [7] originally preceded v. [8].—**7.** The omission of the last clause of v. [6] brings this verse into close connection with the preceding predictions on the same subject. The writer puts what he still has to say into a general prophecy, saying that *Yahweh will help the tents of Judah*, the surrounding country in distinction from the capital, not *first*, as the Massoretic text reads, but, as the great versions have it, *as at the first*. This is evidently a reference to the period in the history of Judah when Hebron and Bethlehem were as important as Jerusalem, and the men of Judah, under the leadership of David and his lieutenants, were the controlling power in Palestine. It is the will of Yahweh that this golden age be restored, and he grants the needed help that *the glory of the house of David, or the glory of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, may not exceed that of* the rest of *Judah;* or, to put it positively, that the glory of rural Judah may equal that of the court and the capital. This verse, therefore, so far from betraying any jealousy or partisanship, seems to have been inspired by the most commendable impartiality.—**8.** Having thus established a standard, the prophet returns to the city, that he may impress upon the reader how much he means by it. He begins with *In that day*, the oft-repeated phrase by which, in this and the following chapters, a new subject is usually introduced. The inhabitants of Jerusalem are made the starting-point for the further development of his theme. *Yahweh*, he says, *will protect the inhabitants*, not *inhabitant*, *of Jerusalem*. *Cf.* Is. $31^{4 \text{ f.}}$. This thought is not inconsistent with that of the preceding context, for, as at once appears, the protection afforded will be of the kind that stimulates energy rather than encourages supineness. Under the ægis of the Almighty there will be so remarkable a rejuvenation,

that *the weakest among them in that day shall be as David, and the house of David like God.** Wellhausen and others interpret *the house of David* as a designation for the government at Jerusalem. There certainly is no warrant for such an interpretation in Ps. 122^{5}, where the poet is recalling the past glory, not describing the present condition, of Jerusalem. On the other hand, this reference to *the house of David* does not mean that a member of the family still ruled in Judah when this passage was written. It does, however, like v. ^{12}, indicate that he had descendants in Palestine, and that they still cherished hopes of the restoration of the dynasty.—At first sight the added phrase, *like the angel of Yahweh before them,* looks like a gloss by some one "very jealous for Yahweh," who, like the Greek translators of Ps. 8, was offended that men should be compared to the Deity; but perhaps it is merely an allusion to the Exodus intended more clearly to define the relation of the house of David to the rest of Judah. *Cf.* 14^{10}.

1. על] This prep. in such a connection as the present is usually rendered *against* or *concerning*. *Cf.* 10^{3} Ju. 9^{3}, etc. In this case neither is suitable. The former must be rejected because the oracle that follows is plainly intended, not to disturb, but to encourage. The latter is even more objectionable because, as explained in the comments, Israel is clearly not the subject of the oracle. The incongruity would disappear if ישראל were replaced by ירושלם, the real subject of this and the following chapters, except 13^{7-9}; but, as there seems to be no other warrant for this change, it is necessary, with 10 Kenn mss., to substitute for על the אל of Mal. 1^{1} and translate the phrase *to Israel*. An additional reason for adopting this reading is that the title here found was probably supplied by the author of the one in Malachi or copied from the latter.—Marti questions the genuineness of v.^{b} as well as the title, but he gives no reason for his doubts, except that similar ascriptions have been inserted into the book of Amos. Here, however, if he is correct in his analysis, there is nothing to which to attach such an assumption.—נאם י׳] Sometimes elsewhere, but not often, placed at the beginning of an oracle. *Cf.* Nu. $24^{3.15}$ 2 S. 23^{1} Ps. 110^{1}; Kö. $^{§ 374 f.}$.—נטה] These participles, all three of them, must be construed as referring to past time. *Cf.* שׂם, v. ^{2}; Ges. $^{§ 116. 2 (a)}$.—ארץ ,שמים] Without the art. as usual in poetical language. *Cf.* Is. 44^{24} 51^{13}, etc.; cp. Gn. 1^{1}, etc.—**2.** סף] Second acc. after שׂם. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§ 117. 5 (c)}$. The word more commonly means *threshold;* hence 𝔊,

* On the courage and prowess of David, see 2 S. 17^{8} 18^{3}; on the comparison of the house of David to God, Ps. $8^{6/5}$ Is. $9^{5/6}$ 1 S. 14^{17}.

πρόθυρα; 𝔙, *superliminare;* 𝔖, ܐܣܩܘܦܬܐ; but the meaning *bowl* is required by the context.—וגם—ירושלם] No help in understanding this clause is to be had from the Vrss., which read as follows: 𝔊, καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ ἔσται περιοχὴ ἐπὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ; 𝔙, *sed et Juda erit obsidione contra Jerusalem;* 𝔖, ܐܦ ܥܠ ܝܗܘܕܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܐܘܠܨܢܐ ܥܠ ܐܘܪܫܠܡ. The first does violence to על and both it and the third ignore the prep. ב. The second omits על, thus bringing its rendering into harmony with 𝔗 which reads, *also of the house of Judah shall the peoples bring by violence in the siege to Jerusalem.* Geiger, following 𝔙 𝔗, oms. על, which, he explains, may have been inserted for the purpose of removing the objectionable thought of hostility between Judah and Jerusalem. Stade and others have adopted this view, not considering that the Jews would hardly change the text to avoid an interpretation which they themselves accepted. Marti, who is followed by Kittel, omits וגם על יהודה and for יהיה במצור rds., with 𝔊^{AQ}, Houb., והיה מצור, *and there shall be a siege.* This is simpler than 𝔐, but it is not much more satisfactory, retaining, as it does, the sinister and inconsistent announcement of a *siege against Jerusalem.* The persistence of this disturbing element makes it necessary to regard, not only על or וגם על יהודה, but the whole clause, as a mistaken gloss suggested by 9¹⁴. *Cf.* v. ⁴· ⁶. In this chapter, it must be remembered, the enemies of the Jews do not really succeed in reaching, much less taking, the city.—במצור] Here, acc. to the accentuation, construed with יהיה, as it is with another form of the same verb in Ez. 4³. So Robinson, who om. על and explains the other prep. as a ב *essentiae,* thus getting the unintelligible statement that *Judah will be besieged against Jerusalem.* The interpretation here recommended requires that the verb be construed with the first, and במצור with the second, part of the clause.

3. מעמסה] 𝔊, καταπατούμενον, 𝔖, ܕܫܝܦܐ = מרמס. Better 𝔗, חקלא; but neither is so simple and expressive as 𝔐. The prtc. here has an inceptive sense, which may be reproduced in English by *would lift* or, as it is rendered in the comments, *lift on.*—The latter half of the verse is 14²ᵃ passively expressed. Note especially כל גוי הארץ, instead of the כל העמים of v. ² or the כל העמים סביב of vv. ²· ⁶. The only other place where גוים occurs in this chapter is v. ⁹, *q. v.* On the other hand, it is the characteristic term in ch. 14, where עמים occurs only once, and then in a passage (v. ¹²) in which some mss. have גוים. **4.** נאם י׳] 𝔊 adds παντοκράτωρ. So 𝔖^H, but Kenn. 130 oms. the whole phrase. So Kit.—בשגעון] On the use of the art. with abstract nouns, see Ges. § 126. 2 (c); on the vocalisation in this case, Ges. § 85. 2 (2) (A) (2).—ועל בית וג׳] The genuineness of this clause is attested, not only by the parallelism between it and the first of the verse, but by the occurrence of העמים. *Cf.* vv. ²· ³· ⁶. On the intervening clause, see the comments.

5. אמצה] Rd. אַלְפֵי. *Cf.* 1 S. 10¹⁹, where אלף occurs as a synonym of

משפחה. So We., Now., Marti, Kit. 𝔊^L adds πάντες.—אמצה] Two mss. have אמצא, from מצא, the reading represented by 𝔊 (εὑρήσομεν) and 𝔗 (אשתכח). It does not, however, suit the context. Naturally, therefore, one must reject the suggestion of Brd., that אַמְּצָה is only another form for אֶמְצָא; also of Sta., that the original was אֶמְצְאָה; and of Kui., that it was אֶמְצָא. Hi. conjectures אם צהלו for אמצה לי; which is ingenious, but far-fetched. The same can be said of Marti's נמצא חַיל. They are also unnecessary, since אמצה harmonises with the context when pointed as a noun in either of two forms, אֻמְּצָה ('ŏmṣāh) the fem. corresponding to אֹמֶץ (Jb. 17⁹), for which de R. cites "*nonnulli codices*," or אַמְצָה, the reading preferred by Ki. and adopted by Baer. See 𝔙 (*confortentur*) and 𝔖 (ܠܡܠܟܐ). Acc. to Baer his F has אִמְּצָה, pf. Qal, and his E 3 אַמְּצָה, imv. Pi.; but both are impossible, the former, because it ignores the form of the only word that can be construed as its subj., the latter because a direct appeal to Yahweh is not consistent with the final phrase *through Yahweh their God*.—לי ישבי] Here, on the other hand, there is need of correction, for the words quoted are clearly an error for לישבי. So 𝔗, Dathe, Houb., Seck., Flügge, New., Ort., We., Now., van H., *et al.*—**6.** אלפי] Rd., as in v. ⁵, אַלֻּפֵי.—עָמִיר] Acc. to BDB., *a swath*, but more probably, in view of oriental methods in harvesting, grain in bundles. *Cf.* Am. 2¹³ Je. 9²¹.—וישבה וג׳] This clause is of precisely the same character as those in vv. ²· ⁴ whose genuineness is questioned, having been dictated by a pious jealousy for the inviolability of the Holy City.—בירושלם] Acc. to Houb. a corruption of בשלום, but its omission by 𝔊^{Ne. b AQ} indicates that it is a superfluous gloss to תחתיה. So We., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit.—**7.** בראשנה] So 𝔗. Rd., with Kenn. 30, 180, as in Dt. 9¹⁸, כראשנה, or with Kenn. 17, 228, as in Ju. 20³², כבראשנה. So 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖, Talm., Jer., Dathe. The idea thus conveyed is in harmony with the context, for it is the measure of Judah's glory, and not the date of its achievement, about which Yahweh is concerned. On the construction, see Ges. § 118. 6 (b).—למען לא] This or למען אשר לא (Nu. 17⁵) is stronger than מן. It points, not to a result which the subject would forestall, but to an event which it is his deliberate purpose and policy by all means to prevent. *Cf.* Mitchell, *Final Constructions*, 22 *ff.*—דויד] In 35 Kenn. mss. without י.—ישב] Rd., with 9 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, ישבי. So Bla., New., We., Now.—על יהודה] Rd., with 𝔊^Q 𝔖 𝔗, על בית יהודה; a rare construction, מן rather than על being commonly used to express comparison. *Cf.* Gn. 49²⁶, etc.; Ges. § 133. 1; Kö. § 308 d.—**8.** בעד] In 9¹⁵ על.—ישב] Rd., with 9 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, ישבי, as required by בהם. So New., We., Now., Marti, Kit.—הנכשל] van H. suggests המשל!—ביום ההוא] Not necessary, but, since it adds certain emphasis and improves, rather than disturbs, the rhythm, Kit. is hardly warranted in omitting it.—כדויד] In 20 Kenn. mss. the י is wanting. 𝔊^{AQΓ} rd. ὡς οἶκος Δαυείδ, the first and third omitting ὁ δὲ οἶκος Δαυείδ = ובית דויד, through the fault of a (Greek) copyist. It is not

safe, however, to infer that the text on which these mss. are based read in the first case כבית רויד, since they all have *ὡς οἶκος θεοῦ*, although the original cannot have had כבית אלהים. 𝕿 modifies כאלהים to כרברבין, *like princes*.

(2) *A great lamentation* (12^{9-14}).—The people of Jerusalem, protected by Yahweh and transformed by his Spirit, will be smitten with remorse for their misdeeds, and especially for their cruelty toward a nameless sufferer for whom they will observe a period of poignant and universal mourning.

9. This verse at first sight seems to belong to the preceding paragraph, but the connection between the two is not so close as might be supposed. In those verses the prophet has been dealing with the relations of the Jews to their neighbours, the Edomites, Moabites, etc. He now, as some one undertook to do for him in v. ^{3}, gives the reader a glimpse of a larger world. It is no longer "the peoples round," but, as in ch. 14, *all the nations*, whose fate he describes. His object is to strengthen the assurance already given his people that Yahweh will protect them. He has said that their God will give them the mastery over their neighbours; he now puts into the mouth of Yahweh the declaration, *I will seek to destroy all the nations that come against Jerusalem*, that is, punish with destruction any nation, near or far, small or great, that attempts an attack upon the Holy City. This is one side of the matter. There is another, and it is this latter to which the prophet gives most prominence. The key to his meaning is found in the thought that "the goodness of God leadeth to repentance," which is a favourite with Ezekiel. Thus, in 39^{26} he makes Yahweh say, "They shall bear their shame," realise their faithlessness, "when they dwell safely in their land, with none to terrify."*

10. The bestowment of peace and security is not the only means that Yahweh purposes to employ to change the hearts of his people. The operation of his Spirit is another. *Cf.* Ez. $36^{26\,f.}$. Now, the fruits of the Spirit are various. Here, where it is poured *upon the house of David and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, it is called *the Spirit of kindness and entreaty*. *Cf.* Is. 11^{2}. The word ren-

* Kraetzschmar makes the subject in this passage the heathen, but from $16^{60\,ff.}$ $20^{42\,f.}$ $36^{22\,ff.}$ it is clear that it is Israel. So Ew., Or., Toy, *et al.*

dered *kindness* is usually translated *grace*, and, since the grace of the Bible is oftenest the grace of God, some have inferred that it must be so in this instance. There is, however, a grace of men (Gn. 30^{27}), and, since the word is here associated with *entreaty*, which is properly predicated only of human subjects, it seems fair to infer that the grace or kindness in question is that of the people of Jerusalem.* The thought, therefore, is that the Spirit will produce in the persons named a kindness of disposition and a mildness of attitude by which they have not thus far been characterised. Toward whom? The answer to this question is found in the next clause, which describes the first act growing out of this changed character. It says, *they shall consider him whom they pierced*. To pierce is generally to put to death. *Cf.* 13^{3} Ju. 9^{54}. It is natural, therefore, to infer that the one pierced is here a victim of popular displeasure on whose fate the Jews high and low will one day be moved to reflect, and that because the dislike and harshness that once ruled have given place to their opposites. The identity of the martyr it is difficult to determine. The older exegetes generally see in him the Messiah. Those who adopt this view, however, overlook a point of great importance, namely, that while the effusion of the spirit and the effect produced by it are evidently future, the act of piercing the nameless victim belongs to the past. This means that the one pierced is not the Messiah, whose advent, all will agree, was still future when these words were written, but some one who had at the time already suffered martyrdom. It is easier to establish this point than to go further in the same direction, for, when the attempt is made to find an individual, the victim of popular passion, whose death the prophet would expect to see universally lamented, the inquirer learns that he has raised a question for which extant history has no answer. Zechariah, the son of Jehoida, put to death by order of King Joash,† Uriah, the son of Shemaiah, the prophet who suffered under Jehoiakim,‡ and Gedaliah, the governor treacherously murdered by Ishmael of the seed royal after the overthrow of the Davidic dynasty§ are all too

* In Je. 31^{9} the entreaty is not by Yahweh, but by the people he is leading. Cp. Bu., who for תחנונים reads תנחומים, *consolation*.

† *Cf.* 2 Ch. $24^{20\,ff.}$. ‡ *Cf.* Je. $26^{20\,ff.}$. § *Cf.* Je. $41^{1\,ff.}$.

remote; Jeremiah also, of the manner of whose death there is no reliable information. The second objection holds in the case of Zerubbabel, in spite of Sellin's attempt to identify him with the Servant of Yahweh.* Under the circumstances any plausible suggestion is welcome. One of the most attractive is that the object of consideration in the clause quoted is not a single unfortunate individual, but a considerable number of godly persons who have perished by violence. This interpretation is favoured by the striking likeness between the situation here outlined and that portrayed in Is. 52^{15}–53^{12}, where the loyal remnant of Israel is represented by the Servant of Yahweh. Perhaps the one here pierced represents those who toward the end of the Persian period bore the reproaches of the reproachers of Yahweh and finally shed their blood in his cause. Perhaps, however, the author of this difficult passage took the Servant of Yahweh in Second Isaiah for a historical figure, otherwise nameless, who had died a martyr's death. This is precisely what was done by later Jews, who call him "Messiah the son of Joseph" and represent him as the forerunner of the greater son of David.† Finally,—and this is even more to the point,—they say that he is at the same time the sufferer in the passage now under consideration.‡ The prophet predicts that those who were responsible for the crime committed, or their descendants, will bitterly repent and lament it, using two very strong similes to illustrate the poignancy of their sorrow. *They shall lament for him*, he says, *as one lamenteth for an only son, and they shall grieve for him as one grieveth for the first-born.* It is only necessary to recall the eagerness of the Hebrews for offspring, especially sons, to realise the forcefulness of these figures. *Cf.* Gn. $15^{12 ff.}$ 2 K. $4^{12 ff.}$, etc.

11. There is a third comparison, *In that day*, it runs, *great shall be the lamentation in Jerusalem; like the lamentation of Hadadrimmon in the Plain of Megiddo.* The Plain of Megiddo, according to 2 K. $28^{29 f.}$, was the scene of the battle between the Jews and the Egyptians in which King Josiah lost his life. The Chronicler enlarges upon the story, saying that "all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah," that, indeed, "Jeremiah lamented for

* *Zerubbabel*, 174 *f*. † Weber, *APT*., 346 *f*. ‡ *Cf*. AE., Ra., Ki., *et al.*

Josiah," and "all the male and female singers spake of" him "in their lamentations to" his "day." The custom may have continued until this passage was written. If not, there was the tradition preserved by the Chronicler to suggest the allusion and to be suggested by the mention of Megiddo. At any rate it has always been the prevailing opinion that in the words quoted the writer was referring to the intense and universal grief occasioned by the death of the good king. This is the express teaching of the Targum* and the Syriac Version, the latter substituting "the son of Amon" for the name *Hadadrimmon*. Jerome adopts the same interpretation, explaining that Hadadrimmon was a place, not far from ancient Jezreel, which in his day was called Maximianopolis; and many others have followed his example. It was identified by van de Velde† with "a small village called Rumani about three-quarters of an hour south of Megiddo," doubtless the Rummaneh of later maps, which is located about four miles south-east of Lejjun, that is, Megiddo. According to Conder‡ it is seven and a fourth miles from Zerin, the site of ancient Jezreel. Some modern scholars find in Hadadrimmon, not a topographical detail, but another name for the Babylonian god Tammuz, the Greek Adonis, the anniversary of whose death was observed as a day of lamentation. *Cf.* Ez. 8^{14}. Thus Hitzig, Jeremias§ and others, while Cheyne maintains that the name is merely a corruption of Tammuzadon.** The former of these conjectures has been refuted by Baudissin,†† the latter is too arbitrary to require refutation. It is probable that neither of them would have been suggested had its author duly considered the fact that the mourning for Tammuz was not real, but fictitious, and that therefore there would be little force in a comparison in which it was recalled. There is no serious objection to the earlier view in the form in which it is put by Baudissin, who interprets the expression *the lamentation of Hadadrimmon* as meaning the demonstration by which the Jews expressed their grief, not at Hadadrimmon, wherever it may have been, but

* It reads, "Like the mourning of Ahab, son of Omri, whom Hadadrimmon, son of Tabrimmon slew, and like the mourning of Josiah, son of Amon, whom Pharaoh slew in the Plain of Megiddo."

† *Syria and Palestine*, i, 355. ‡ *Tent Life*, i, 129. § *AT.*, 113.

** *Cf. EB.*, art. *Hadadrimmon*. †† *Studien*, i, 305 *ff.*

over the irreparable loss they there suffered.*—**12.** The lamentation will not only be bitter, but universal. This thought is expressed by the method of enumeration, which, however, is not carried beyond a certain limit. First comes the general statement that *the land shall mourn each family by themselves*. The family is the largest division named because the author confines himself to the territory of Judah. He brings the families forward one after another, not, as Wellhausen imagines, from a fondness for processions and ceremonies, but for the purpose of reinforcing the thought that he wishes to convey. They will all join in the lamentation because each of them will have peculiar reason for mourning. Indeed, in *the house of David*, the first in rank and importance, and in all the others as well, *their women* will lament *by themselves*. The second family to receive mention is *the house of Nathan*. There is no means of identifying with certainty the head of this family, but since, in the next verse, the name Levi is followed by another from the genealogy of the priestly tribe, it is not improbable that the Nathan of this passage is the son of David of that name. *Cf.* 2 S. 5^{14}.†—**13.** The priests must have united with the princes against the martyr, whoever he was, as they finally did in the case of Jeremiah. *Cf.* 37^{15} 38^{4}. At any rate, *the family of the house of Levi* will be among the mourners, and that in all its branches; for this seems to be what the author means by adding *the family of the Shimites*, this family being, according to Nu. 3^{21}, among the descendants of Gershom, the eldest son of Levi. Attention has already been called to the significance of the relation between the tribes of David and Levi as here presented. *Cf.* p. 258. It indicates that the passage belongs to a comparatively late date. See Je. $33^{14\,ff.}$ as compared with $23^{5\,ff.}$.—**14.** The names enumerated represent the ruling classes, who were doubtless largely responsible, as in the case of the persecution of Jeremiah, for the outrage now lamented. The rest, however, cannot have been guiltless. They might have been introduced according to their families, but, if the list had been greatly lengthened, it would have defeated the author's purpose. He therefore cuts it

* *Studien*, i, 319 *f*.
† Others identify him with Nathan the prophet. So Jer., Ra., Pres., Brd., *et al.*

short at this point, only adding by way of summation, *all the families that are left, each family by themselves, and their women by themselves.*

9. In this chapter the enemies of the Jews have been their gentile neighbours, and have been called העמים; except in v. ^{8}, where the last clause was pronounced a gloss, because it deviated in both respects from the context. The recurrence of הגוים naturally makes one suspect another addition to the text, and this may be the case; but it is also possible that, just as העמים is once used in ch. 14 for הגוים (v. ^{12}), so, by a slip of the pen of either the author or a copyist, הגוים has here taken the place of העמים. For another alternative, see the comments.—הבאים] De R. 319 marg. has הצבאים; but the Mas. expressly says that the latter word is found only in Nu. 31^{48} Is. $29^{7\,f.}$. *Cf.* Baer, notes, 84.—**10.** דויד] In 25 Kenn mss. י is wanting.—יושב] Rd., with 26 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, יושבי.—רוח] With two genitives, a rare construction of which, however, there are three cases in Is. 11^{2}. *Cf.* Ges. § 128. 1.—ותחנונים] The pl. as an abstract noun. *Cf.* Ges. § 124. 1 (*b*) *Rm.*—אלי] The prep. with the sf. of the 1st sg.; no doubt the reading of the great majority of the mss. and edd. It is also the one represented by 𝔊 𝔏 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 Aq. Σ Θ, and adopted by Norzi, Dathe, de R. Baer, Gins., *et al.* There are, however, serious objections to its genuineness. In the first place, it does not harmonise with the following context, where the one to whom it is predicted that the Jews will look is apparently referred to in the third person. One method of meeting this objection is to make the sf. of עליו refer to the act of piercing (Grot., *et al.*); but this interpretation is arbitrary and unnatural, and it is disproved by the comparisons by which the author illustrates the grievousness of the mourning predicted. Others, following 𝔊 𝔗, treat את אשר as if the text had על אשר. This device is naturally a favourite with Jewish scholars, who see in the relative a reference to Messiah, the son of Joseph (AE.), or some other martyr or martyrs. So Ra. It must be rejected because the language used cannot properly be so interpreted. A second objection to 𝔐 is that, when taken in its most obvious meaning, it passes the limits of permissible anthropomorphism. Those who defend it seek to meet this difficulty by saying, with Köh., that Yahweh here identifies himself with the sufferer, so that he "regards a thrust through the Redeemer as a thrust that he himself has suffered." So Pres., Wri., *et al.* It is very doubtful if the author of the passage would go so far as this, but, if he did, why did he not write עלי instead of עליו, thus carrying the thought far enough to make it unmistakable? Thus far mention has been made of but one reading. There is another, אליו. It is found in 45 of the mss. collated by Kenn. and de R. It is the oriental, as distinguished from the occidental reading. *Cf.* Baer, notes, 89. It appears in Talm. (*Suk.*, v, 52) and in early editions of the commentaries of AE.,

Ra., Ki. Another witness for the same reading is the NT., for in Jn. 19^{37}, where this passage is quoted, it is rendered *ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν*. See also Rev. 1^{7}. This reading is the more remarkable because it varies, not only from the Heb., but also from 𝔊, where, although the words *ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν* are found in a series of mss. either with (𝔊^Γ) or without (𝔊^L) the alternate reading, *ἀνθ' ὧν κατωρχήσαντο*, they are always preceded by *πρὸς μὲ* = אלי. The following Fathers follow the NT. in omitting *πρὸς μὲ* and thus practically accepting the reading אליו: Justin, Clement, Alexandrine, Barnabas, Theodoret, Ignatius, Irenæus, Tertullian. Objection was made to the present reading that it did not harmonise with the following context or present an idea that could safely be attributed to the author of the passage. No such objection can be urged against אליו. The point may, however, be made, and, in fact, has been made by de R., that אליו is the easier reading; hence it is more probable that it is an error for אלי than *vice versa*. There is great force in this objection. Indeed, it so weakens the case for אליו that those who feel the incongruity of the Massoretic text will have to resort to emendation. The NT. points the way. Following it one may, with Bla., om. את, and, for אלי, rd., either with Bla., אֱלֵי, as in Jb. 3^{22}, or the prosal form אל, thus obtaining the result aimed at in changing אלי to אליו. On the construction אל אשר, see Ez. 42^{14}; Ges. § 138 (2). We., *et al.*, see in את a relic of a fuller reading; but a more probable explanation is that it is a variant for אל or the result of an attempt to mend the text after אל or אל־ had become אלי. Mention should here be made of the ingenious emendation proposed by van H., who puts a pause after אלי and for וספדו rds. יספדו.—והמר] The inf. abs. continuing the discourse after a finite vb. *Cf.* Ges. § 113. 4 (a). Perhaps the original was והמרו. So 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, Houb. Some such word as אֵבֶל is to be supplied as an object. *Cf.* Am. 5^{16}.—**11.** הדדרמון] This name has various forms in the mss., but they can all be explained as the results of the carelessness of copyists. Acc. to Che. it has gone through the following modifications: הדדרמון—רמון—מרון—מגרון—חמואדון! Van H., following 𝔊 (*ῥοῶνος*), rds. רמון.—מגרון] 𝔖, with 13 mss., rds. מגדו.—**12.** משפחות משפחות] Rd., with 𝔊^AQΓ, משפחה משפחה. *Cf.* Gn. 32^{17}.—לבד] Throughout this and the following verses with ‑֑, even with the lesser distinctives. Add., with 𝔊 𝔗, ונשיהם לבד.—דויד] In 27 mss. י is wanting.—ולבד] Jer., in his translation of 𝔊, inserts here, *Tribus domus Judæ seorsum, et mulieres eorum seorsum*.—**13.** השמעי] Kenn. 155, בת השמעי; 1, 102, בית שמעי. So 𝔗. 𝔊, *τοῦ Συμεών*; Σ, *οἴκου Συμεών*; so 𝔖.—משפחת משפחת] In 26 Kenn. mss., משפחות משפחות; yet rd., with 𝔊, משפחה משפחה.

(3) *A great purification* (13^{1-6}).—A general announcement is followed by a more detailed prediction concerning the suppression of idolatry and false prophecy.

1. In the preceding paragraph the author brought his revelations to a point at which his people, by divine aid, realised and lamented their blindness and cruelty. The change makes it possible for Yahweh to introduce a better state of things. This paragraph, therefore, begins with a promise, *In that day there shall be a fountain opened for the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem*, the whole community. The fountain, as at once appears, is to be taken figuratively, being provided, not for external soilure, but *for sin and impurity*. The reference to sin recalls the great crime of the preceding paragraph, and suggests that the announcement here made is virtually a decree of absolution for the same; but this is not the case. If it were, the language used would be different, and this verse would have to be attached to the twelfth chapter. The key to the writer's meaning is found in the word *impurity*,* a technical term for ceremonial defilement, especially that caused by menstruation. *Cf.* Lv. $12^{2.5}$ $15^{24\,ff.}$, etc. Ezekiel uses it frequently of the corrupting effect of idolatry. Thus, in 36^{17} he makes Yahweh say that the way of the house of Israel before him has been "like the uncleanness of (menstrual) impurity"; which in v. [18] is explained as meaning that they have defiled the land "with their idols." But the most significant feature of Ezekiel's prophecy is the promise (v. [25]), "I will sprinkle upon you clean water; from all your uncleanness and from all your images will I cleanse you"; for it is pretty clear that this passage is the original from which the one now under consideration was freely copied. If so, this first verse looks forward rather than backward, being, not a decree of absolution for past offences, which seems to be taken for granted, but a promise of security from future contamination by unclean associations. In Is. 12^{3} the same fountain supplies the redeemed people with unstinted draughts of salvation.—**2.** This view of the passage is confirmed by the context, for here, as in Ezekiel, the figurative term *impurity* is at once explained by a reference to idolatry. *Cf.* Ez. 36^{25} 37^{23}. *I will cut off*, says Yahweh, the names of the idols, cause all mention of them to cease, *from the land*,† *and they shall be no more remembered*. *Cf.* Ho. 2^{19}. The latter half of the verse contains an announcement, at first sight rather

* נדה.

† Not *earth*, with Bla., Hd., *et al.*

startling, but it is not so new and radical as it has been represented. The author does not mean to make Yahweh say without qualification that he will remove the prophets from the land. Here, as above, he is evidently following Ezekiel, trying, however, to say in a sentence what the earlier writer took much more space to express. The teaching of Ezekiel is found in the fourteenth chapter of his prophecies, where Yahweh first instructs him with reference to the lay member of the house of Israel who, taking "his images to his heart," comes to the prophet, that the latter may consult Yahweh for him. Then he adds (v. ^{9}), "and, if the prophet be deceived and speak a word, I, Yahweh, have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand against him and destroy him from the midst of my people Israel; . . . as the punishment of the one that consulteth him, so shall the punishment of the prophet be." In other words, the prophet, when, and because, he encourages, or neglects to rebuke, evil tendencies among his people, will be destroyed with them. *Cf.* Dt. $13^{2/1\,ff.}$. If, therefore, *the prophets* here include the whole guild, it is not because they are prophets, but because they have individually proven themselves unworthy of their high calling. *Cf.* Je. $23^{9\,ff.}$. This is clear from what follows. The whole sentence reads, *The prophets, also, and the spirit of uncleanness will I remove from the land.* Here, again, the writer is simply summarising Ezekiel. That prophet makes Yahweh say: "A new heart, also, will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; . . . and I will save you from all your uncleanness; . . . and ye shall loathe yourselves in your own sight for your iniquities and your abominations." *The spirit of uncleanness*, then, must be the disposition to neglect the precepts of Yahweh, or even worship the abominations of other peoples; and the reference to the prophets in this connection may be taken to indicate that, when it was made, they were prominent exponents of a widespread disloyalty, that, in fact, the word *prophet* was then almost synonymous with *false prophet*.

3. The suppression of these false prophets will require time and, in the end, the most unflinching severity. If necessary, however, the Deuteronomic law requiring one to put one's relatives to death for attempted seduction from Yahweh will be applied. *Cf.* Dt.

$13^{7/6\,ff.}$. *If a man still prophesy*, persist in posing as a prophet, *his father and his mother who begot him* will be his judges and executioners. The sentence, *Thou shalt not live*, is based on a charge, *Thou hast spoken falsehood in the name of Yahweh*, which, at first sight, seems to conflict with the interpretation thus far followed. It must, however, be remembered that the gods of the nations did not require the exclusive devotion of their worshippers, and that, therefore, there was no reason, so far as they were concerned, why the Jews who served them should not at the same time serve Yahweh. Indeed, this is precisely what Ezekiel, in a passage already quoted (13^7), accuses them of doing. *Cf.* Je. $7^{8\,f.}$. There is therefore nothing incongruous in the fact that prophets who have been condemned for idolatry are here represented as speaking in the name of the true God. Neither Yahweh nor one of his loyal worshippers, however, can tolerate such a form of syncretism. The parents of the offender, therefore, if he persists in his course, *shall pierce him through when he prophesieth*.—**4.** *The prophets* generally will not continue their unwarranted utterances in the name of Yahweh. *They shall be ashamed, each of his vision;* shall shrink from making public, as they are accustomed to do, their fictitious revelations. They will cease to desire to be recognised as prophets. Therefore *they shall not longer*, like wolves in sheep's clothing, *wear a hairy mantle*, apparently a customary badge of the prophetic office, *for the purpose of deceiving*, making the false impression that they are genuine men of God.*—**5.** Not that they have any scruples against deception: far from it; for, when it suits their interests, as, for example, when they are threatened with retribution by their outraged dupes, they will not hesitate to lie, saying, one and all, *I am not a prophet.* They will even, so great will be their demoralisation, seek a refuge among the humblest of the community, each of them declaring, *The soil hath been my possession from my youth*.—**6.** The scene here described is one that may have taken place more than once in the streets of Jerusalem.

* There is some difference of opinion about the garment in question. Rosenmüller and others think it was of cloth woven from goats' or camels' hair, like that of John the Baptist. *Cf.* Mt. 3^4. It is more probable, however, to judge from Gn. 25^{25} and 2 K. 1^8, that it was made from skins and intended to recall the simplicity of primitive times. See the customs of the Rechabites and the Nazirites.

It is now drawing to a close. It should have a dramatic character. Otherwise it might as well not have been portrayed. The proper effect can be produced in only one way. A cowering wretch has been accused by an indignant mob of being a false prophet. He denies it and points to his rustic dress as proof of his innocence. Since his defence is a falsehood, justice requires that he should be unmasked. The question, therefore, with which he is now assailed must be interpreted as an attempt to reach this result. In other words, when his accusers ask, *What are these wounds between thy sides?* that is, on thy back, they mean that the wounds proclaim him at the same time a prophet and a liar. On the text, see the critical notes; on the subject of flogging among the Hebrews, Dt. 25³ Pr. 19²⁹, etc.; *DB.*, art. *Crimes and Punishments.* The reply has been variously understood. The last words of it have sometimes been rendered *in the house of my lovers.* This, however, though literal, is not correct, for *my lovers*, as usage abundantly shows, could only mean false gods, and that in the mouth of the Jewish people under the figure of an unfaithful wife. *Cf.* Ho. 2⁵ Je. 22²⁰ ᶠᶠ· Ez. 16³³ ᶠᶠ·, etc. What the suspected prophet actually says is, *Those with which I was smitten in the house of my friends.* By his friends he doubtless means his parents. If so, the wounds, or rather the scars, he bears are the traces of punishment which he has received under the paternal roof. This may mean that the wounds were inflicted by his parents either in the ordinary course of rigorous discipline,* or for the offence of attempting the rôle of a prophet.† Perhaps the ambiguity is intentional. If so, the words must be regarded as a clever attempt of the accused to throw his inquisitors off the scent without telling another absolute falsehood. So Maurer.

1. מקור] 𝔊, *πᾶς τόπος* = כל מקום. A palpable error, 𝔐 being supported by Aq. (*φλέψ*) and Σ Θ(*πηγή*) as well as 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.—לְחַטָּאת] Rd. לְחַטָּאת, there being but one instance, and that a doubtful one, of the use of the cstr. before a ו. So Sta., Now., Marti, Kit. Cp. Ges. § 130 (2).—ולישבי—ולנדה] $𝔊^{QH}$ $𝔖^{H}$ om.—2. צבאות] Om., with $𝔊^{AQ}$.—עוד] Kenn. 4, 112, 150 add בשמם from Ho. 2¹⁹.—הנבאים] 𝔊, *τοὺς ψευδοπροφήτας.* So 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.

* So Theod. Mops., Ki., Dru., Köh., Klie., Pres., *et al.*
† So Jer., Theodoret, Cal., Hi., Brd., *et al.*

—**3.** כי] *If and as often as*, a frequent usage in legal language. *Cf.* Ex. 21[14], etc.—ואביו ואמו ילדיו] Twice questioned by Kit., but without reason given. *Cf.* Dt. 13[10/9].—ודקרהו] 𝔊, *συμποδιοῦσιν*, as if from ועקדהו, Gn. 22[9]; but Aq. Σ Θ have *ἐκκεντήσουσιν*.—**4.** בהנבאתו] A case, the only one in Niph., of confusion between an inf. from a final א, with one from a final ה vb. *Cf.* Ges. § 74. 3. R. 2. Rd. either בהנבאו or בהנבאם; or, since the word is really not only useless, but incongruous, omit it altogether.—ולא] 𝔊 oms. the negative owing to a mistaken interpretation of למען ילבשו which it renders *ἀνθ' ὧν ἐψεύσαντο*.—ילבשו] Twenty Kenn. mss. add עוד. So 𝔗.—**5.** אנכי] Kenn. 112 adds, from Am. 7[14], ולא בן נביא אנכי.—איש—אנכי] An explanatory marginal gloss, omitted by 𝔊^AQΓH, which should have been inserted, if at all, at the end of the verse. Then כי would have retained its original adversative meaning. *Cf.* Am. 7[14].—אדם הקנני] The text is unintelligible. The vb. קנה means *get* in a broad sense, including the acquisition of the products of one's own efforts and the possessions of others. It may therefore be rendered *create* and *rescue* of God, and *acquire* and *purchase* of men. The derivative מִקְנֶה means *possession*, or, since the wealth of the early Hebrews consisted principally of animals, *cattle*. The Hiph., the form here used, naturally has the sense of a causative, and has generally been so rendered. Some of the renderings are: 𝔊, *ἐγέννησεν*; Dru., *taught me* (husbandry); AE., *made me a landowner;* Ra., *made me a cattleowner;* Ges., *sold me as a slave;* Houb., *bought me as a slave*. The last is the most widely accepted; but the thought that it expresses is hardly one to be expected in this connection. A far better reading is secured by the emendation suggested by Wellhausen, viz., אדמה קניני, *the soil hath been my possession*, which is so simple and plausible that it has been generally adopted. If, however, this is the original form of the final clause, here is another reason for regarding the one preceding as a gloss.—**6.** ואמר] The subj. is personal, but indefinite. *Cf.* Ges. § 144. 3 (a).—ידיך] If the text is correct, the word יד, *hand*, is here, as elsewhere, used in the sense of זרוע, *arm*, and *between the hands* has the meaning that "between the arms" has in 2 K. 9[24], namely, between the shoulders or on the back. Perhaps, however, ידיך is an error for צדיך, *thy sides*, this being the word required by the context and the one favoured by 𝔊^L, which has *ὦμος* here as well as in Is. 60[4] 66[12], where 𝔐 has צד. So also Aq. Σ Θ. Sta. retains the reading of the text, but adds ועל עיניך.—אשר] For אשר—כהן. *Cf.* 12[4].—בית] For בבית. *Cf.* Gn. 38[11] etc.; Ges. § 118. 2 (b). Burger rds. בַּיִת מְאהבי, *at home by my friends*.

b. THE JEWS AND THE NATIONS (CH. 14).

The thought of the chapter is one, but it takes four phases in the course of its development. The first has to do with

(1) *The recovery of the Holy City* (14^{1-5}).—The city is destined to be taken and plundered, but Yahweh will appear and by a stupendous miracle throw the nations into confusion and rescue the remaining inhabitants.

1. The general announcement with which the chapter opens is addressed to Jerusalem. *Lo*, it says, *there cometh a day for Yahweh*, a day appointed by him for the fulfilment of his purpose, *when thy spoil shall be divided within thee.* Note the difference in tone and content between this statement and the opening verses of ch. 12. In the latter passage the writer does not admit that Jerusalem is in danger. He represents it as rather a menace to the surrounding peoples. Here he is obliged to face the prospect, if not the reality, of a successful invasion of the country. This, however, is only one side of his vision. There is a brighter one to be revealed. —**2.** The above interpretation takes for granted that the fuller description of the fate of the city which follows is by the same author. This is denied by Marti and others, chiefly because here for a space Yahweh speaks and Jerusalem is in the third person. But this, as has been shown, is not a sufficient reason for denying the genuineness of a passage, since such changes occur in cases in which the hand of the original author is generally recognised. See the comments on $12^{7f.}$. Note also that throughout the rest of this chapter Jerusalem is in the third person. Finally, its retention is required by "the nations" of v. [3]. The first clause, *I will gather all the nations to Jerusalem for battle*, recalls Ezekiel's great prophecy (38 *f.*) concerning Gog, from which some of the more striking features of the chapter were evidently borrowed.* Here, however, there is no attempt to create interest or sympathy by dwelling on the size and character of the invading army. The author is more concerned with the modifications of Ezekiel's predictions which time and events have made necessary. The prophet of the

* *Cf.* Ez. $38^{19ff.}$ 39^{10}; also Is. $13^{2ff.}$.

Exile does not allow Gog and his hordes actually to attack Jerusalem. They no sooner appear on "the mountains of Israel" than the jealousy of Yahweh is excited and he empties the vials of his wrath upon them. The author of this passage does not insist on the inviolability of the city, but goes so far as to teach that it will again be overcome and treated as captured cities in his day were usually treated. *The city shall be taken*, he says, *and the houses plundered, and the women ravished*. *Cf.* Am. 7^{17} Is. $13^{1.\ 15\ f.}$. He even foresees another deportation, in which *half of the city shall go forth into captivity*. Then, as explained in the next verse, Yahweh will interfere, so that *the rest of the people shall not be cut off*. If this passage were by the same author as $13^{8\ f.}$, the remnant would now be only a sixth of the original population.

3. The rest of the paragraph has a decidedly apocalyptic character. Thus there is here no hint that the Jews will do anything in their own defence when their capital is attacked. Nor will Yahweh attempt to avert the catastrophe, but, after the city has been taken, he *will come forth and fight with those nations*, the nations that he himself, according to v. [2], has brought thither to display his power upon them. *Cf.* Ez. $39^{2\ ff.}$. In 9^{14} Yahweh comes "in the tempests of the South"; here he seems to descend from heaven. *Cf.* Mi. 1^{3}. At any rate, the next clause, *as when he fighteth in the day of conflict*, is an apparent allusion to Jb. $38^{22\ f.}$, whose "stores of hail . . . reserved . . . against the day of conflict" must be located in the sky. *Cf.* Jos. 10^{11}. The author cannot, like Joel ($4/3^{16}$), have thought of him as issuing from Sion, since the city is supposed to be in the hands of the enemy. *The day of conflict* is interpreted by some as a general expression,* by others as an allusion to a particular event, like the Exodus;† but it were better, perhaps, to combine the two views, for, even if the writer intended a general reference, he must have had an event like the Exodus in mind.—**4.** When Yahweh descends to meet his people's enemies, *his feet shall stand on the Mount of Olives*. There follows a description of the situation of this eminence, which Marti pronounces an interpolation. He thinks it was not necessary to tell the people

* So Bla., Hi., Köh., Pres., Reu., *et al.*

† So Jer., Grot., à Lap., Rosenm., Mau., Ew., Burger, Hd., *et al.*

of the city that the mountain was *over against Jerusalem eastward*. This, however, is not the only reason that can be given for his opinion. The clause is not important. The omission of it, therefore, causes no embarrassment, for there can be no doubt that *the Mount of Olives*, as it is here called for the first time in the Old Testament, is "the mountain that is on the east of the city," over which, according to Ez. 11^{23}, the glory of Yahweh hovered when he took his departure from the temple. This mountain, the modern name for which is *Jebel et-Tur*, is not a single peak, but a ridge, with three or four more or less prominent summits, the highest rising 2,723 feet above the level of the sea. The part of it over against the city is everywhere higher than any part of the city itself. It therefore completely obstructs the view in that direction, but furnishes an excellent pedestal for such structures as the Russian Belvedere. When Yahweh makes his descent upon it, it *shall be cleft through its middle, eastward and westward, by a very great*, that is, a very wide, as well as a very deep, transverse *gorge;* for, under his feet, *half of the mountain*, rent from its foundation, *shall recede northward, and* the other *half of it*, in like manner, *southward*. *Cf.* Ez. $38^{19\,f.}$ Mi. 1^4 Na. 1^5 Ju. 5^5 Hb. 3^6 Ps. $18^{8/7}$ 1 K. $19^{11\,f.}$.

5. The object of the author in v. [4] seems to have been to present an impressive picture of the power of Yahweh. He now completes it by the addition of another realistic touch; as a result of the violent change in the contour of the Mount of Olives, *Gihon*, the intermittent spring in the Valley of Kidron, now called "The Spring of St. Mary" or "The Spring of the Steps," *shall be stopped*, as it had been by other means more than once in the history of Jerusalem. *Cf.* 2 Ch. $32^{4.\,30}$. In explanation of this result he says, secondly, that *the gorge of the mountains*, the great cleft already described, *shall reach to the side of it* (Gihon), that is, across the Valley of Kidron to the hill on which the City of David was situated. These are simple and natural details perfectly intelligible to one who is acquainted with the Mount of Olives, but, by a curious error, they have been so distorted in the Massoretic text that the stoppage of the spring has become a flight by the gorge through the mountain like the escape of the fathers from the Egyptians by the miraculous passage through the Red Sea. Later some one added a compari-

son with the flight *before the earthquake in the days of Uzziah king of Judah.* This is no doubt the earthquake mentioned in Am. 1^{1}, which, according to Josephus, occurred while Uzziah was trying to force his way into the temple, against the protests of the priests, to offer incense on the golden altar.* This scene, with which, as a historical event, every one was familiar, the glossator says, will be repeated when Yahweh cleaves the Mount of Olives asunder.† There is little comfort in such a prospect. Compare that presented by the latter half of the verse, where the original author, continuing his description, says, *Then shall Yahweh thy God come, and all his holy ones with him;* the holy ones being the angels who serve as his attendants and messengers.‡ Here the description of the deliverance of Jerusalem is for the time being discontinued. For the fate of the nations, see vv. $^{12 ff.}$.

1. יום בא] The sg. indefinite, here only. *Cf.* Je. $50^{27.31}$ Mal. $3^{19}/4^{1}$.—וחלק] *When*, etc. Ges. $^{§ 164.1 (a)}$. The rhythmical character of this verse favours the idea expressed in the comments, that it is the theme of which the more prosaic part that follows is the development.—**2.** ואספתי] Marti, as remarked in the comments, rejects this verse, for one reason because Yahweh speaks here in his own person. He is then obliged to omit בגוים ההם in v. ^{3}. A simpler way of meeting this difficulty would be to rd. here ואסף, *and he will gather*.—במלחמה] This noun, when it is governed by ב or ל, almost always (103 : 6) has the art.—ונשסו] 𝔐, *vastabuntur* = ונשמו.—תשגלנה] Qr., תשכבנה, a less objectionable word which in 15 Kenn. mss. has taken the place of the original reading. On the change in the tense, see Ges. $^{§ 112.1.R.2}$.—**3.** בגוים ההם] These words presuppose v. ^{2} and are therefore omitted by Marti. *Cf.* v. ^{2}.—כיום] Rd., with 𝔐, כמו.—**4.** ביום ההוא] Om., with oriental mss. and 𝔖.—אשר—מקדם] On the genuineness of this clause, see the comments.—הר הזיתים] The reasons for omitting this phrase are: (1) It is unnecessarily explicit. The original author would have used ההר, as he does below. (2) It is easily explained by the insertion of אשר—מקדם and the consequent separation of the subj. of נבקע from its antecedent.—גיא] The abs. without the art., like the cstr., has ◌ַ, except in Is. 40^{4} (גֶיא), גַיְא in 1 S. 17^{52} being an error for גַת. See also בְּלִיל, Is. 15^{1}, and כְּלִיל, Is. 16^{3}. On the construction, the acc. of condition see Ges. $^{§ 118.5 (c)}$. It is here fem.—

* *Cf. Ant.*, ix, 10, 4; 2 Ch. $26^{16 ff.}$.

† This, of course, is what is meant by *as ye fled*, for the most careless scribe would hardly, as Marti imagines, represent those of his own time as the contemporaries of Uzziah. For a precisely similar case, see 8^{14}.

‡ *Cf.* Dt. 33^{2} Ps. $89^{6 ff.}$ Jb. 15^{15}.

מחציו—ויםה] 𝔊^B, τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς καὶ θάλασσαν, 𝔊^{ALQΓ}, τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ πρὸς ἀνατολὰς καὶ τὸ ἥμισυ αὐτοῦ πρὸς θάλασσαν; clearly mistaken, because contradictory of what follows.—מחציו—מאד] Marti would omit all these words, but, if the verse must be further shortened to make it conform to his metrical scheme, the clause that follows, which simply enlarges on the thought here expressed, might better be sacrificed.

5. וְנַסְתֶּם] The pf. 2d pl. Qal from נוס. This is the occidental reading, and it is found in almost all the mss. that have been collated. It is supported by 𝔙 𝔖, and it has naturally been adopted in the printed texts and by a majority of the commentators. So Jer., Ki., Dru., New., Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Burger, Hd., Köh., Ke., Klie., Pres., Pu., Or., Wri., GASm., *et al.* The oriental reading, however, is וְנִסְתַּם, the pf. 3d sg. Niph. from סתם, *stop*. It is found in only 4 of the mss. cited by de R., but it has the support of 𝔊 𝔗 𝔖^H Aq. Σ Θ, and it is the one preferred by Josephus, Ra., and, among Christian scholars, Marck, Dathe, Flügge, Bla., We., Now., Marti, Kit., *et al.* The latter reading, it will be noticed, is the one adopted by the latest authorities. These scholars, however, have strangely overlooked one point, and thus failed to seize the writer's precise meaning. This point is the peculiar force of the word סתם. It occurs elsewhere in a literal sense eight times, viz., Gn. $26^{15.18}$ 2 K. $3^{19.25}$ 2 Ch. $32^{3.4.30}$ Ne. 4^{1}. In the last case it is used of closing the breaches of the wall of Jerusalem, but in all the rest the thing closed is a well or a spring, and this is the usage also in Aram. If, therefore, the oriental is the correct reading, it is more than probable that the subject is not this or that valley, but one of the springs in the vicinity of Jerusalem; and, since there are only two, it ought not to be impossible to discover which of them is meant. Josephus, in his description of the earthquake in the reign of Uzziah, mentions a place called *Eroge*. This name is, no doubt, a corruption of *En-rogel*, and, since the historian evidently had this passage in mind, one might infer that the spring stopped by the convulsion here described is the one just below the junction of the valleys of Kidron and Hinnom now called "the well of Job." A closer examination of the language used by Josephus, however, shows that he, like some modern writers, confounded *En-rogel* with Gihon, and that the place to which he refers is the site of the spring now called "The Spring of St. Mary." See further on the question of the identity of Gihon and *En-rogel*, *JBL.*, xxii, 103 *ff.* If, then, it is a spring that is to be stopped, that spring is probably Gihon, and its name should be substituted for the meaningless phrase גיא הרי. The origin of the error can easily be traced. The scribe, in copying the text, after writing the first two letters of גיחון, looking up, caught, not the word that he had been writing, but גיא הרים, and nearly finished it before he saw his mistake. Then, instead of correcting the error, he proceeded with his task. This is a simpler emendation than that proposed by We. (גיא הנום) which, moreover, carries with it the

mistaken assumption that the Valley of Hinnom was on the east of Jerusalem.—The emendation suggested at first sight seems to find no support in the following clause, but it is only necessary, for אצל, to read אצלו, to produce the entirely satisfactory statement that *the gorge of the mountains shall reach to the side of it, i. e.*, the side of Gihon. On the construction with נגע, see Hg. 2^{12}.—גי] Rd., with 48 Kenn. mss., גיא.—אצל] See above. The sf., being followed by another ו, was easily overlooked.—ונסתם] Here clearly a derivative from נוס, as both the occidentals and the orientals point it. So also 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗.—מפני] 𝔊, *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις*, except L.—אלהי] Rd. אלהיך, the final ך having been lost by haplog. So Marti, Kit.—כל] Rd., with 83 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗, וכל. So We., Now., Marti, Kit.—קדשים] So 𝔊 𝔙. Rd., with 𝔖 𝔗, קדשיו. So New., Reu., We.—עמך] Rd., with 45 mss., 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗 $𝔖^H$, עמו. So Dathe, Houb., New., Bla., Hd., Reu., We., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit., van H., *et al.*

(2) *The transformation of Judah* (14^{6-11}).—The author interrupts himself at this point to describe another miracle by which the country about Jerusalem will become a Paradise.

6. With the coming of Yahweh will begin a new era for Jerusalem and Judah, the most peaceful, blissful and glorious in their history. The description of it should begin with this verse. It is clear, therefore, that the text, which now says that there shall then be no light, is corrupt, and that the original reading must have been, *There shall no longer be cold and frost*, such as sometimes add to the discomforts of a Syrian winter.* In other words, the climate of the country will be so modified that it will never be too cold for the comfort of the fortunate inhabitants.—**7.** The abolition of cold and frost will be accompanied by a still more miraculous transformation in existing conditions; for thenceforward *there shall be continuous*, lit., *one, day*. At this point the description of the coming day is interrupted by a pathetic outburst from a pious scribe who seems to have thought the day here promised to be "the day of Yahweh." *It is known to Yahweh*, he says, meaning thereby not so much the event as the date of its arrival.—There follows an explanation of the rather ambiguous expression with which the verse began. The day in question is first defined negatively as *not* alternating *day and night*. Then, to make his meaning unmis-

* The temperature in the hills of Palestine seldom falls below the freezing-point, but the winds that sweep over the country in the winter often cause the poorly fed and scantily clothed inhabitants extreme suffering.

takable, the writer adds, *yea, it shall come to pass that at eventide there shall be light.**

8. The picture is not yet complete. An oriental Paradise must have what Jerusalem and Judah always lacked, plenty of water. Thus, "a river went out of Eden to water the garden" of Gn. 2, and in Ezekiel's description of the Palestine of the future a stream issues from under the threshold of the sanctuary and flows eastward with growing volume, carrying health and fertility to that entire region. *Cf.* $47^{1\,ff.}$. The picture here presented, like Jo. $4/3^{18}$, is an adaptation of that of Ezekiel. The modifications are interesting. Thus, *there shall go forth*, not from the sanctuary, but *from Jerusalem, living water*, fresh water from an unfailing source, flowing, *half of it toward the eastern sea, and half of it toward the western sea*, the same being the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. Finally, an inference from Ez. 47^{12} is here put into the form of a statement to the effect that these streams, unlike most of those with which the Jews were familiar, would be perennial; *in summer and in winter shall it*, the water, *be*, continue to flow. Rain, therefore, would be as unnecessary as in Egypt. *Cf.* v. [18].

9. Thus far the writer's vision has been restricted to Palestine, and, indeed, apparently to that part of it known by the name of Judea. The scope of this verse is universal. It asserts that *Yahweh shall be king over*, not merely the whole of Palestine, but *all the earth;* and this is followed by the declaration that *in that day Yahweh shall be one, and his name one;* in other words, that Yahewh shall then be worshipped by all men, and that under the one name, Yahweh, revealed to the Chosen People. Now, one can hardly claim that all this is foreign to the thought of the author of the chapter. In vv. [16 f.] he expresses himself in a similar fashion. In view, however, of the lack of relation with the following as well as the preceding context, it is safe to conclude that he did not so express himself in this connection.—**10.** This verse, on the other hand, is precisely in line with the thought of v. [8]. It continues the description of Jerusalem and its future surroundings, for the configuration of the country, it seems, is to be changed as well as the meteorological and other conditions. The city will be the centre,

* *Cf.* Is. 2^5 30^{26} Rev. 21^{23} 22^5 Is. $60^{19\,f.}$.

and *the whole land*, hitherto in places considerably higher, and in others considerably lower, ***shall stretch round it like a plain***. The limits of the plain in two directions are given. It will extend *from Geba to Rimmon*. The former of these places is the modern *Jeba* on *Wadi Suweinit*, opposite Mikhmas (Michmash), about six miles north of Jerusalem. *Cf.* 1 S. 14[5]. In the reign of Asa it was fortified by this king (1 K. 15[22]), and from that time onward was regarded as the northern limit of the kingdom of Judah. Hence the expression in 2 K. 23[8], "from Geba to Beersheba." The place of the latter is here supplied by *Rimmon*. This is without doubt the "*En-rimmon*" of Ne. 11[29], for which Jos. 15[32] has "*Ain* and *Rimmon*," and Jos. 19[7] and 1 Ch. 4[32] have "*Ain, Rimmon*." It has been identified with *Umm er-Rammamin*, a site about ten miles north-east of Beersheba with a fine spring and the ruins of a considerable town. It was among the places reoccupied by the Jews on their return from exile. *Cf.* Ne. 11[25 ff.]. Beersheba was another; but perhaps when this passage was written it had been lost or abandoned. The significance of these geographical details has been discussed in the Introduction, where it was shown that a writer whose vision was bounded by the places here named cannot have been the author of chs. 9–11. In the midst of the plain just described, which, as appears from v. [8], will be bounded on the east by the Dead Sea, and on the west by the Mediterranean, Jerusalem *shall sit aloft in its place*, on account of the depression of the surrounding country more prominent than ever. *Cf.* Mi. 4[1] Is. 2[2]. There follows what looks like an outline of the limits of the city corresponding to the description already given of the extent of the country belonging to it. At first sight it is a little confusing, but, if the Gate of Benjamin be identified with the Sheep Gate of Ne. 12[39], and located north of the temple in the wall connecting the Tower of Hananel with the north-east corner of the sacred enclosure in its original dimensions,* and the phrase, *to the site of the First Gate*, omitted as a gloss, the meaning of the author will become apparent. He gives first the width of the city from east to west: it shall extend *from the Gate of Benjamin*, which although it was not so far north, was farther east than the Tower of

* *Cf.* Je. 37[13] 38[7]; Guthe, *ZDPV*., v, 282.

Hananel, *to the Corner Gate*. This gate, as its name indicates, was at the north-west corner of the city,* and therefore in the so-called "Second Wall." The length from north to south is marked by two objects familiar to those for whom the passage was written, *the Tower of Hananel* at the north-west corner of the present Haram,† and *the king's wine-press*, which must have been in or near the Valley of Hinnom. Jerusalem as thus described would be about as large as that part of the city now within the walls, but it would not occupy the same ground, the southern limit being now some distance outside the walls. The language here used implies that it was not so large when the passage was written.—**11.** The city having been restored in these generous proportions, *they*, the people whose right it is by the favour of Yahweh, *shall dwell in it* undisturbed; *for there shall not again be a curse*, bringing destruction, *but Jerusalem shall be a safe habitation*. *Cf.* Je. 33^{16} Ez. $34^{27 f.}$.

6. והיה] 𝔊^{AQΓ} 𝔖 om., but since the expression ביום ההוא is frequent in chs. 12–14, both with and without והיה, and 𝔖 regularly omits the vb., it seems impossible to determine the original reading. See the comments on 12^3.—אור וג׳] The text is evidently corrupt, because, as explained in the comments, it does not say what the author must have intended. Most of the attempts to emend must be rejected on the same ground. The rest are objectionable for some other reason. Ew. renders, *there shall not be light and* (alternating with it) *cold and ice*. This is unsatisfactory, because the terms of the hypothetical comparison are not opposites. The attempt of We. to remedy this defect is exposed to criticism from another point of view. He substitutes חום for אור, thus getting *there shall not be heat and cold and frost*. So Oort, Now., Marti, Kit. The objection to this proposal is that חום, if it had ever had a place in the text, would hardly have been mistaken for a word so different and so much less suitable in this connection. Neither of these objections can be brought against the simpler expedient of replacing אור by עוֹר, and reading, as proposed in the comments, *there shall no longer be cold and frost*. The אור of 𝔐 is easily explained by its appearance in v. [7]. The next two words, as now pointed, are usually rendered *jewels* (stars) *shall dwindle*, but there can be no doubt that, with 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖 𝔗 Σ, one should rd. קָרוּת וְקִפָּאוֹן, *i.e.*, as above, *cold and frost*.—**7.** הוא—יהוה] The incongruousness of these words is proof that they are an interpolation. Marti would read יֵרוּעַ but with this prtc. the pronoun would

* *Cf.* 2 K. 14^{13} Je. 31^{38}; *JBL.*, xxii, 136 *ff.*

† *Cf.* Je. 31^{38} Ne. 3^1 12^{39}.

probably have taken the second place. *Cf.* Ges. § 141. 4; Nrd. §§ 772. 1; 772. 𝔗 connects this clause with the words that follow, thus, ***it is known before Yahweh, not as light by day, nor the opposite by night.*** **8.** והיה] Wanting in 𝔊 𝔖. *Cf.* v. 6.—מים] In Hebrew *water* is pl.; but this is not the English idiom. In the EV., therefore, the sg. should be substituted for the pl., not only of the noun, but of the pronouns of which it is the antecedent.—יהיה] 𝔖 om. We. retains the word, but puts it into the pl. with 𝔙. So Now., Marti, Kit. The change, however, is unwarranted. The thought of the author is correctly reproduced in 𝔊 by ἔσται οὕτως. If he had meant to make the subj. of this vb. מים, he would have repeated יצא, as 𝔗 does in יהון נפקין.—**9.** On the genuineness of this verse, see the comments.—**10.** יסוב] The absence of the connective can hardly be intentional. Read, therefore, with 𝔙 𝔖, ויסב. So Houb., New. On the gender, see Ges. § 145. 7 (a). The word never elsewhere means *change*, a fact that should have made Kö., *et al.*, think twice before rendering it so in this connection.—כערבה] The absence of the art. seems to have been intended to prevent the reader from supposing, as do Kö., *et al.*, that the author had the valley of the Jordan in mind. *Cf.* Ges. § 126. 2 (b) (A) (2). Acc. to Kit. this word is omitted by some authorities; but, if סב means *lie about*, it is necessary to the complete expression of the author's idea.—נגב] With the force of מנגב ל. *Cf.* Jos. 15⁷; Ges. § 118. 2 (b).—ראמה] Not, as one would gather from Ges. § 72. 7. R. 1, the prtc., but the pf. 3d sg. fem., to agree with ישבה. The א is therefore here a vowel letter, and the correct vocalisation that of *Ben Naphtali*, רָאֲמָה. Similar forms occur elsewhere in the prtc. as well as in the pf. *Cf.* Ho. 10[14] Ju. 4[21], etc. Van H. rds. חרום, with ירושלם for its subj. On the (adverbial) relation of this vb. to the next, see Ges. § 120. 2 (a).—ועד—הראשון] This phrase is not only superfluous but unintelligible. The attempt by Kö., *et al.*, to save it by repesenting the author as taking his stand at the middle of the northern boundary and pointing out the limits east and west of that position ignores all precedents. It is doubtless a gloss to עד שער פנים, or, as it should read, עד שער פנה (2 K. 14[13]), by some one who identified the Corner Gate with the so-called שער הישנה of Ne. 3[6] 12[39]. On the omission of the art., see Ges. § 126. 5. R. 1 (a). Marti would om. much more of the verse, viz., as far as חננאל inclusive; but this seems too much to sacrifice to his metrical theory. See also Kit.—ומגדל] Rd., with 33 mss., 𝔙 𝔖, וממגדל. So Dathe, New. Acc. to Bö. it is a case of breviloquence. So Hi., Ke., Kö., Wri., *et al.*—**11.** וישבו בה] Marti oms. these words, and they do seem superfluous. If they are retained, they should be attached to the preceding verse.

(3) *The fate of the nations* (14[12-15]).—In this paragraph the prophet resumes his description of the relief of Jerusalem. The nations and their cattle will be smitten by a swift and deadly

plague, and when, in their desperation, they turn their arms against one another, Judah will take advantage of the opportunity to attack and destroy them.

12. The Jews believed that Yahweh controlled all the calamities to which mankind were subject, and that he employed them to correct or destroy those who offended him.* In $38^{18 \text{ ff.}}$ Ezekiel threatens Gog with a variety of such inflictions, the first three being earthquake, panic and pestilence. The author of this passage introduces the same three, but in a different order. The earthquake he has already described. Now comes a *plague with which Yahweh will smite all the peoples that have served*, taken military service, *against Jerusalem.*† The effects of it are described in detail. When men are attacked by it, *their flesh shall rot away while they stand on their feet;* as if from leprosy, only, of course, much more rapidly.‡ The mere mention of such a mode of death makes one's flesh creep; how much more a detailed description! Yet the writer seems to dwell with satisfaction on the horrible particulars, as he recites how *their eyes shall rot away in their sockets, and their tongues shall rot away in their mouths.* The passage belongs to a class of which Ps. 137^{9} is the most frequently cited example. The cruelty of which they are the expression is revolting, but it is hardly surprising in view of what the Jews suffered at various times from their oppressors.—**13.** The effects of this plague will not be measured by the number of persons who actually die of it. In such cases there is apt to supervene a demoralisation more destructive than the original epidemic. *Cf.* 12^{4}. The writer predicts that it will be true in the case of this plague, that the havoc made by disease will unman the bravest of the hostile soldiery, and, in their frenzy to escape, they will fall upon one another with the weapons intended for the Jews. *There shall be a great panic,* he says, adding, with the disregard for secondary causes characteristic of the Hebrews, *from Yahweh.* In a few words he gives a vivid description of the struggle: *They shall seize, each his fellow,* with one hand, *and his* other *hand shall rise,* be uplifted, *against the hand of his fellow.* It will be a fight to the death at close quarters.§

* *Cf.* Am. $4^{6 \text{ ff.}}$ Lv. $26^{14 \text{ ff.}}$ Dt. $28^{15 \text{ ff.}}$

† *Cf.* Ez. 38^{22} 2 K. 19^{35}.

‡ *Cf.* Lv. 26^{16} Dt. $28^{21 \text{ f.}}$.

§ *Cf.* Ju. 7^{22} 1 S. $14^{14 \text{ ff.}}$.

14. The first clause of this verse is ambiguous. It may with equal propriety, so far as Hebrew usage is concerned, be rendered, *Judah, also, shall fight in Jerusalem* or *Judah, also, shall fight against Jerusalem;* but the latter is probably what the writer intended to say. So the Vulgate. It is not, however, probable that in so saying he meant to assert or imply that on this occasion the Jews outside the city would be arrayed against its rightful inhabitants. The situation does not require such an interpretation. The nations, according to v. ^{2}, have captured the city, but Yahweh has appeared to rescue his people. The conquerors, thrown into confusion and consternation, are engaged in destroying one another. Now, it would be ridiculous, under these circumstances, to represent the rural Jews as taking the part of the gentiles. If, therefore, the clause is genuine, and *against* is the proper rendering for the preposition, it must be Jerusalem, wholly or partly occupied by the gentiles and attacked by Yahweh, against which he means to say that Judah will fight. This position can be maintained without reference to the following context. When that is taken into account, especially if, as in the Greek, early Latin and Syriac versions, the verb of the next clause is rendered actively, one may be even more positive. In fact, it may be claimed that the above is the only consistent interpretation, since, unless Judah were to fight against the gentiles, there would be no sense in saying that it (they) should *collect the wealth of all the nations, gold, and silver, and garments*, the spoils gathered during the invasion which must now be abandoned, *in great abundance*. *Cf.* Ez. $38^{12\,f.}$ $39^{9\,f.}$.

15. The text now returns to the subject of the plague, and continues it, as if this verse immediately followed v. ^{12}, by adding that *there shall be a plague*, not only among the offending nations themselves, but also *on the horse, the mule, the camel, and the ass, even all the cattle that are in those armies*, and it will prove as destructive to them *as this plague*, namely, the one described in v. ^{12}. will be to the gentiles themselves. *Cf.* Ez. 38^{20}.

12. ואשר] The rel. takes the place of the second, internal, obj. *Cf.* Ges. $^{§\,117.\,2}$.—העמים] An exception, as already (12^{9}) noted, to the usage of this chapter, which requires הגוים, just as in 12^{9} הגוים is an exception to the rule in that chapter. In this case there are 5 Kenn mss. in which the

copyist has recognised the usage and changed the text to make it uniform. —המק] This word, as pointed, is the Hiph. inf. abs. and an appositive of ואת. *Cf.* Gn. 17^{10} Lv. 6^{7} Dt. 15^{2}; Ges. § 113. 1 (*a*). The other forms of the same vb. found in this verse, however, are from Niph.; nor is the vb. elsewhere used in any other stem. It is therefore probable that the original reading in this case was הָמֵק. The inf. abs. is precisely adapted to portray the suddenness of the infliction described and the rapidity with which it will do its work. *Cf.* Ges. § 113. 4 (*b*) (*δ*) and (*ε*).—בשרו] The sf. is distributive. It is therefore properly rendered in 𝔙 by *caro uniuscujusque*, and in 𝔖 by ܒܣܪܗܘܢ, *their flesh*. *Cf.* Ges. § 145. 5. R.—והוא וג׳] A circumstantial clause, *while he*, etc. *Cf.* Ges. § 156. 1.—בפיהם] Rd., in harmony with the analogous cases, בפיו. *Cf.* Mal. $2^{6f.}$. So Bla., We., Now., Marti, Kit.—**13.** This verse and the one following are rejected as secondary by the later critics, but, if the interpretation given to them in the comments is correct, it is clear that they have a place in the author's picture. Note הגוים (v. [14]), one of the characteristic words of this chapter.—ויהיה] Om. 𝔙 𝔖.—תחיה] 𝔊 oms., exc. a few curss.—יד] The acc. construction is very rare, except in the cases of sfs. Rd., therefore, with 53 mss., ביד, or, with 𝔖, ברעהו.—ועלתה] This makes tolerable sense, but it is difficult to understand how 𝔊 got from it *καὶ συμπλακήσεται*, 𝔏, *et implicabitur*, 𝔙, *et conseretur*, 𝔖, ܘܢܬܩܦܣ, and 𝔗, ויתחלש; for all of which ורבקה would seem to be a more probable original.—**14.** יהודה] The word is here used of the country, and is therefore fem. *Cf.* Ges. § 122. 3 (*a*). —בירושלם] The preposition עַל is used with the place against which war is urged 16 t., and ב almost as often. *Cf.* Jos. 10^{31} Ju. 1^{8} $9^{45.52}$ 11^{12} 1 S. 23^{1} 2 S. $12^{26.27.29}$ 1 K. 20^{1} Is. 20^{1} Ne. 4^{2} 2 Ch. 35^{20}. Cp. Robinson, 62 *f.*—ואסף] Rd., with 𝔊 (*καὶ συνάξει*), 𝔏 (*colliget*), and 𝔖 (ܘܢܟܢܫ). ואֻסַּף.—סביב] Om. as inconsistent with the meaning of הגוים in this chapter. It was borrowed from $12^{2.6}$.—**15.** הסוס] The sg. with the art. is here used of the class. Hence it may properly be translated by the pl., as it is by 𝔊. *Cf.* Ges. § 126. 3 (*a*).—והחמור] Ordinarily each noun after the first has ו. *Cf.* Gn. 12^{16} 24^{35}. Sometimes, however, as in English, the connective is used only with the last. Here it marks the end of the series, and the one with the next word introduces a collective including the four classes enumerated. *Cf.* Ges. § 154. note (*a*) and (*b*).—יהיה] In 28 mss. תהיה, the more frequent construction; but the masc. of the vb. after a fem. subj. is also allowable. *Cf.* Gn. 5^{5} Ex. 12^{16}; Ges. § 145. 1. R. 2. The presence of כל has no influence. *Cf.* 9^{19} 11^{1}.—כמגפה] In 15 Kenn. mss. במגפה; but 𝔐 is preferable. So 𝔊 𝔙 𝔖 𝔗. Marti sacrifices the whole phrase to metrical considerations.

(4) *A universal sanctuary* (14^{16-21}).—The nations, thus chastened, will be disposed to recognise Yahweh as the true God, but, if any refuse so to do by presenting themselves at the feast of tabernacles

in Jerusalem, they will receive further punishment. To accommodate them the sanctity of the temple and its furniture will be extended, not only to the city, but the whole of Judah.

16. The natural effect of the inflictions above described will be to exalt Yahweh in the eyes of the nations. Ezekiel, at the end of the parallel passage, makes him say, "I will make myself known in the eyes of many nations, and they shall know that I am Yahweh." The author of this paragraph puts it even more strongly. He says that, after these plagues, the gentiles will not only recognise Yahweh, but that *all that are left of all the nations that came against Jerusalem shall come up from year to year to worship the King, Yahweh of Hosts*, at the very shrine that they would have destroyed. They will not be required, as are the Jews by the Law, to appear before Yahweh thrice every year, but they will be expected *to keep the feast of tabernacles*, the last and most important of the annual festivals, and the only one originally celebrated at the central sanctuary.* A universal pilgrimage to the Holy City every year would, of course, be impossible, yet the terms used are such that the prophet seems to have believed that it could be realised.—**17.** A failure to observe this requirement will be severely punished. Moreover, the punishment will fit the offence. The feast of tabernacles, or, as it was sometimes called, the feast of ingathering, was a festival of thanksgiving for the harvest just completed. *Cf.* Ps. $65^{10/9\,ff.}$. A refusal to celebrate it would argue an ingratitude which could not be more appropriately punished than by withholding rain, which began to fall soon after the feast of tabernacles, and thus preventing a normal harvest in the following year. Hence it is decreed that, *if any of the families of the earth come not up to Jerusalem to worship the King, Yahweh of Hosts, on them*, these ingrates, or, strictly, their soil, *shall there be no rain*, and, consequently, no crops.

18. The case of Egypt receives special treatment. The reason is evident. That country is, and always has been, watered, not from the clouds, but by the river Nile. *Cf.* Dt. 11^{10}. This being

* *Cf.* Ju. 21^{19} 1 K. 8^2 12^{32}, etc. In Is. 66^{23} the extravagant prediction is made that "from one month to another, and from one week to another, all flesh shall come to worship" before Yahweh, but in this case "all flesh" includes only the Jews within reach of the temple. *Cf.* Jo. 3^1.

the case, a threat to withhold rain would have been ridiculous. The prophet says, therefore, that, *if the family of Egypt come not up and present themselves, then on them shall be the plague with which Yahweh shall smite all the nations*, namely, the plague described in v. [12]. In the Massoretic text the nations are defined as those *that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles;* but, although this clause is properly used in v. [19], in this one, if translated according to the punctuation, it makes the writer say that the Egyptians will be punished in the same way as the other nations; which, as appears from v. [19], is precisely what he did not intend to say. If, on the other hand, the punctuation be so changed that the latter half of the verse will read, *then on them shall not be the plague*, etc., he is prevented from saying how the Egyptians will be punished. These considerations show that Marti is correct in not only changing the punctuation and omitting the third negative, but in pronouncing the relative clause with which the verse now closes a gloss borrowed from v. [19].—**19.** The correctness of the above reconstruction of v. [18] is shown by the harmony between the verse as emended and the statement which now follows. *This*, says the prophet, referring to vv. [17 f.] as a whole, *shall be the* special *punishment of Egypt, and the* common *punishment of all the* rest of the *nations that come not up to keep the feast of tabernacles*. It is clear that Egypt would not here have received special mention unless in the preceding verses there had been described two distinct methods of treating those who neglected the annual pilgrimage.

20. The prophet in thought follows the pilgrims to Jerusalem. He seems to have pictured them to himself as journeying thither on horses. Now, the Hebrews did not at first look with favour upon the horse. The prophets, in this, as in many other matters, preserved the attitude of the fathers. They regarded the animal as a symbol of foreign pomp and power. *Cf.* Is. 2^{7} Dt. 17^{16} Ez. 38^{4}, etc. Therefore in portraying the peaceful future to which they taught their people to look forward, they naturally represented it without horses. See 9^{10} and Mi. $5^{10/9}$, but especially Zc. 9^{9}, where the future king is represented as making his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, not on a horse, but on an ass. In the present instance the prophet does not banish the horse from the Holy Land,—

it would have been cruel to the pilgrims from remote regions,—but gives the animal a new meaning. In the good time coming *shall the bells*, or tinkling ornaments, *of the horses*, and, of course, the horses themselves, *be holy to Yahweh*. The horse is holy because he brings, not a warrior, to kill and waste, but a pilgrim to worship at the temple of Yahweh. The writer saw that the participation of the gentiles in the celebration of the feast of tabernacles would tax the resources of the temple, and made provision for it. He begins by saying that *the pots in the house of Yahweh shall be as the bowls before the altar*. These words are capable of more than one interpretation. One is that the vessels used for inferior purposes will become as holy as the bowls from which the blood of sacrifices is sprinkled.* To this, however, there is the serious objection that there is no apparent ground for supposing one of these classes of vessels to have been regarded as holier than the other. Wellhausen and others, therefore, prefer to think that it is their size with reference to which the vessels are compared; but if, as the name given to them warrants one in inferring, the *pots* are the vessels used in cooking the flesh of the sacrifices (v. [21] Ex. 16[3]), they must already have been larger than the bowls for the blood of the victims. These objections can be avoided by supposing the writer to have meant that the supply of bowls in the temple would be so scanty that the pots would have to be used for the same purpose. The increase in the number of worshippers will create in the house of Yahweh a deficiency in cook-pots, which will be the greater because some or all of the vessels of this class already provided have been taken to meet the need of bowls. This deficiency will be supplied from year to year, by the resident Jews, for *every pot in Jerusalem and Judah*, like those in the temple, *shall* then *be holy* because at length the land and the people have been sanctified.† The supply will be so generous that *all that sacrifice shall come and take of them and cook therein*, according to custom, the flesh allotted them for the sacrificial meal.‡ Most of the sacrificers will have to obtain animals for sacrifice at Jerusalem, but they will not be able to buy them within the sacred precincts,

* So Marck, Mau., Hi., Köh., Klie., Brd., Hd., Pu., Or., Rub., Wri., *et al.*

† *Cf.* Is. 11[9] 62[12] Ez. 20[40], etc.

‡ *Cf.* 1 S. 2[13] Dt. 12[f.] 2 Ch. 35[13], etc.

as they seem to have done when this passage was written and as they continued to do until the time of Jesus (Mt. $21^{12\,f.}$), for *there shall no longer be a trader* in the house of Yahweh of Hosts in that day*. *Cf*. Jo. $4/3^{17}$.

16. כל הנותר] The sg. prtc. with כל and the art. has the force of a pl. Hence ועלו in the next clause. *Cf*. Ges. $^{§§\,127\,(d)\,R.\,1;\,145\,(d)\,R.\,2}$. Kenn. 72 has יעלו.—שנה בשנה] The later idiom for שנה שנה. *Cf*. Ges. $^{§\,123\,(d)\,R.\,1}$.—להשתחות] On the form, see Ges. $^{§\,75.\,6.\,R.\,18}$.—**17.** אשר] Kenn 154, perhaps correctly, כל אשר. See עליהם.—מאת] Rd., with 𝔊 𝔖, מאת כל.—ולא] On the ו, see ועלו, v. ^{16}; on the position of the negative, before the emphatic word, Ges. $^{§\,152.\,2.\,R.\,2}$.—For v. ^{b} most mss. of 𝔊 have *καὶ οὗτοι ἐκείνοις προστεθήσονται* = ואלה עליהם יהיו נִגָּשָׁם (Köh.); but 𝔊^{L} follows 𝔐. So also Aq. Σ Θ.—ולא באה] Corrupt. Rd. either ולא הבא, or ובאה without the negative. *Cf*. Ex. 28^{43} Lv. 19^{12}, etc.; Ges. $^{§\,152.\,3}$.—ולא עליהם] Rd., with Kenn. 624, 𝔊 𝔖, ועליהם, the לא having been imported from v. ^{17}. So Houb., Ew., Burger, Sta., We., Kui., Now., Marti, GASm., Kit., van H., *et al*. The punctuation must also be changed so that this word will become a part of v. ^{b}.—את הגוים] Rd., with 83 mss., 𝔊 𝔙, את כל הגוים. The oriental reading is את כל העמים, as in v. ^{12}, to which the threat here made has reference. So also 11 mss.—On the rel. clause with which the verse closes, see the comments.—**19.** In 11 Kenn. mss. this verse is wanting; but the Vrss. have it, and, when properly interpreted, it has a place in the discourse.—**20.** על] Rd., with 5 Kenn. mss. and Talm.^{BJ}, כל; which is also required by v. ^{21}.—מְצִלּוֹת] This is the reading preferred by Jerome's Jewish teachers, but the text of his day had מצלות here as well as in 1^{8} and 10^{11}. Hence the *βυθὸν* of Aq. Θ. Van H. suggests for this and the following word מְצִלִּית וסיר, which he renders *poêles et marmite*.—והיה] The sg. for the pl. *Cf*. Ges. $^{§\,145.\,7\,(a)}$.—**21.** Kit. rejects the last two words ביום ההוא, and Marti, without sufficient warrant, questions the genuineness of the whole clause from ולא onward.

* Literally, *Canaanite*, but such cannot be the meaning in this connection, since the nations as such will be free to visit the temple.

INDEXES.

I. SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

II. PASSAGES INCIDENTALLY DISCUSSED.

III. HEBREW WORDS AND FORMS REQUIRING SPECIAL ATTENTION.

A
CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY
ON THE
BOOK OF MALACHI

BY

JOHN MERLIN POWIS SMITH, Ph.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

INTRODUCTION TO MALACHI.

§ 1. THE BOOK OF MALACHI.

1. *Its Contents.*

The theme of the prophecy is stated clearly in the opening section of the book (1^{2-5}), viz. that Yahweh still loves Israel, notwithstanding the fact that appearances seem to tell against a belief in such love. The second and main section (1^{6}–3^{12}) points out in detail some of the obstacles that stand in the way of the full and free exercise of Yahweh's love toward his people. These obstacles are found in the failure of the people in general and the priests in particular to manifest that respect and reverence toward Yahweh that are due from a people to its God (1^{6}–2^{9}); in the fact that native Jewish wives have been divorced in order that the way might be cleared for new marriages with foreign women—a proceeding exhibiting both inhumanity and apostacy (2^{10-16}); in the general materialism and faithlessness of the times, which call in question the value of faith and righteousness and will make necessary the coming of a day of judgment (2^{17}–3^{6}); and in the failure to render to Yahweh generously and willingly the tithes and offerings that are his due (3^{7-12}). The last section (3^{13}–4^{6}) takes up again the note with which the prophecy opens, and it assures the pious that their labours have not been in vain; for in the day of Yahweh which is near at hand Israel's saints will experience the protection of Yahweh's fatherly love, whereas the wicked will perish. The book is evidently well planned, being knit together into a well-developed and harmonious whole.

2. *Its Unity.*

The essential unity of the Book of Malachi has never been called in question. Editorial additions are few and slight. The

only passages that have been attacked as not belonging to the original prophecy are $2^{7.\,11.\,12}$ and 4^{4-6}. In the case of $2^{7.\,11.\,12}$, the attack can hardly be deemed successful (*v.* com. *in loc.*). But the editorial origin of 4^{4-6} must be granted (*v.* com. *in loc.*). The recent attempt of Riessler to demonstrate the presence of three strata in Malachi, viz. (1) fundamental prophecies, (2) parallels to the foregoing, and (3) notes, all three of which go back in the last analysis, nearly *in toto*, to the original writer himself, can be regarded only as a *curiosum*. The critical procedure upon which this assignment rests is subjective and arbitrary in the highest degree.

It is probable that Malachi once circulated as one of a small collection of prophecies which also included Zechariah, chs. 9–11 and 12–14, and perhaps chs. 1–8. The three superscriptions, Zc. 9^1 12^1 Mal. 1^1, are apparently either from the same hand, or Zc. 12^1 and Mal. 1^1 were modelled after Zc. 9^1. In either case, they testify to the close relationship of this group of prophecies at some point in the history of their transmission prior to their inclusion within the Book of the Twelve, where Malachi now stands as an independent book.

3. *Its Style.*

The style of Malachi is clear and simple. It is at the same time direct and forceful. It makes but little demand upon the imagination of the reader. The element of beauty is almost wholly lacking, there being but slight attempt at ornamentation of any kind. The figurative element is very limited; but such figures as are employed are fresh and suggestive. A marked characteristic is the frequent use of the catechetical method, in accordance with which general statements are met by questions calling for nearer definition or for citations of fact. This gives a certain appearance of vivacity to the discourse which tends to maintain interest. This method was carried to extremes in the later rabbinical dialectics.

In distinction from most of the prophetic books, Malachi must be classified as prose. Neither in spirit, thought, nor

form, has it the characteristics of poetry. Certainly, there is an occasional flash of poetic insight and imagination, or a few lines which move to a poetic rhythm. But only by the loosest use of terms could we call the prophecy as a whole poetry. All attempts to treat it as poetry have involved much pruning of the text in order to bring the lines within the necessary limits of a poetic measure.* If Malachi is to be regarded as poetical, either in form or content, distinctions between poetry and prose must be abandoned.

§ 2. THE TIMES.

The Book of Malachi furnishes no statement regarding the time of its origin. Nor does external testimony aid much in determining its date. The citation from 4^6 which occurs in BS. 48^{10} does, indeed, put practically out of the question the Maccabaean date proposed by some.† The mere fact of the presence of Malachi in the prophetic canon would seem to preclude the possibility of a Maccabaean date; for BS. 49^{10} shows that the Book of the Twelve was already organised in the days of Ben Sirach. It is not at all likely that as late as the Maccabaean period a new book could have been incorporated among the Twelve, involving as it would either the omission of a book previously admitted, or the consolidation into one book of some two of the books already in the Book of the Twelve.‡

For further information regarding the time in which Malachi was written, we must depend upon the more or less indirect testimony of the contents of the book itself. The reference to Edom in 1^{2-4} raises our hopes. Edom has evidently received quite recently some telling blow which has left her prostrate. Israel's hatred of Edom is thereby gratified. This attitude toward Edom is one which characterised Israel continuously from

* Witness the arrangements of Marti, Siev., Now.[K], and Riessler.

† Viz. Wkl. and Spoer. The reply made by Spoer to the objection here urged is that Malachi may have quoted from BS.. But this is unconvincing, because the whole context in BS. is made up of allusions to and quotations from the OT., the very next line to the one in question being a citation of Is. 49^6; whereas Mal. 4^6 bears the stamp of originality.

‡ *Cf.* F. Brown, in *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects—A Testimonial to Chas. A. Briggs* (1911), pp. 68, 77; G. B. Gray, *Isaiah* (*ICC.*, 1912), xliii *ff.*.

the time of the fall of Jerusalem, when Edom had taken advantage of Judah's helplessness to seize a part of Judah for herself (Ez. 35^{10-12} 36^{2-5}; *cf.* Is. 63 and Ob.). Any great disaster to Edom after this time would meet the requirements of this oracle.* Unfortunately, the history of Edom from the time of the exile to the outbreak of the Maccabaean revolt is almost wholly unknown. We do know that Southern Judah was called Idumaea as early as 312 B.C.† and that about that time the Nabataeans had already pressed in from the South and dislodged the Edomites from their ancient fastnesses. But the exact period at which the expulsion of the Edomites by the Nabataeans took place is as yet unknown.‡ It is not at all improbable that this overrunning of Edom by the Nabataeans was the disaster to which our prophet refers. If so, the origin of Malachi must fall somewhere between 586 B.C. and 312 B.C..

A nearer approximation to the period of Malachi has been sought by some through the use of the word "governor" (פחה) in 1^{8}. The only "governors" of Judah who could be identified were Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. But upon the basis of the Elephantine papyri, we can now add Bagoas. These three, however, represent the entire period from 536 B.C. to 407 B.C.. Moreover, it is clear from Ne. 5^{14} that Zerubbabel was not the only "governor" prior to Nehemiah. Furthermore, the use of the word "governor" was so general (*cf.* Je. $51^{28.57}$ Ez. 23^{6} Est. 3^{12}) that there is no reason to suppose that it ceased even with the passing of the Persian Empire. The Persians took over the title from the Babylonians and doubtless passed it on to the Seleucid dynasty. In later times, indeed, it was actually applied to the chief priests in Judaea.§ Hence, this term conveys no specific information regarding the date of the Book of Malachi.

One definite date is furnished us by the contents of the prophecy. It is quite evident that the temple was already rebuilt

* *Cf.* the kindly feeling toward Edom attested by Dt. $23^{7f.}$.

† Diodorus, XIX, 94–100, where the contemporary record of Hieronymus of Kardia is cited as authority for this statement.

‡ Ez. $25^{4.10}$ may reflect the invading movements of the Nabataeans.

§ *V. Bikkurim*, cited by Schürer, *Geschichte*, 4th ed., vol. II., p. 328.

(1^{10} $3^{1.10}$). Not only so, but the enthusiasm engendered by Haggai and Zechariah, which had carried the temple to completion, had passed away. The community had had sufficient time since that event to realise that the high hopes entertained by those prophets had not materialised. The conditions of life after the building of the temple were as hard and barren as they had been before and there was no visible sign of relief. This fixes the *terminus a quo* at about 510 B.C..

The *terminus ad quem* seems to be set by the reforms of Nehemiah, for the abuses attacked by Malachi are exactly those against which the reform was directed. The temple-services and offerings had fallen into disrepute ($1^{7.13}$). The priests themselves had grown careless, contemptuous and skeptical in the discharge of their official duties ($1^{6-8.12.13}$ $2^{1.8}$). Tithes and offerings had been allowed to lapse, through the feeling that godliness was not profitable for all things and that the service of Yahweh was a one-sided contract, in accordance with which Israel gave everything and received nothing (2^{17} $3^{7-10.14}$; *cf.* Ne. 10^{32-39} 13^{10-13}). In addition to these evils, the Jews had especially signalised their descent from spiritual heights by having divorced their Jewish wives and having entered into new marriages with non-Jewish women belonging to the influential, but mongrel families of the vicinity (2^{10-16}; *cf.* Ezr., chs. 9–10; Ne. 10^{28-30} 13^{23-31}). Even the few words devoted by Malachi to the social wrongs of the times (3^{5}) find their justification in the conditions recorded in Nehemiah's memoirs (Ne. 5^{1-13}). The Book of Malachi fits the situation amid which Nehemiah worked as snugly as a bone fits its socket.

Yet the precise point at which the writer of Malachi appeared still eludes us. The conditions found by Nehemiah did not, of course, develop suddenly, but were the outcome of a long social process. There may, indeed, have been no appreciable change in the situation for a quarter of a century or more before the arrival of Nehemiah. Malachi would be intelligible as coming from any portion of such a period. Some would place it before the coming of Ezra;* others, contemporary with Ezra and Ne-

* So *e. g.* We.(?), GASm.(?), Now., Cor., $Bu.^{Gesch.}$, $Sta.^{Theol.}$, Marti, van H., $Du.^{Pro.}$

hemiah;* still others, during Nehemiah's absence at the Persian court;† while a few would place it during or after Nehemiah's second visit to Jerusalem.‡ It is difficult to regard Malachi as coming from any time when Nehemiah was actually in Jerusalem; because 1^{8} implies the presence of a governor who was accustomed to receive gifts from the citizens, while Nehemiah distinctly says that he did not avail himself of this privilege (Ne. $5^{15.\ 18}$). On the whole, it is best to interpret the author of Malachi as one who prepared the way for the reforms of Nehemiah. He betrays no knowledge of any contemporary or recent reform movement; whereas if he had participated in the reform, he would almost certainly have reinforced his words by referring to the solemn covenant to which his hearers had recently subscribed, while they were now violating it daily at every point.

The choice of the period immediately preceding the reform is supported by the hints given in the prophecy as to the code of laws in force at the time it was written. No distinction is made, for example, between the priests and the Levites; in 2^{4-8}, the terms "priest" and "Levi" are apparently coterminous; and in 3^{3}, the "sons of Levi" as a class are represented as qualified to offer sacrifice, whereas in the legislation introduced in connection with the reform the right of sacrifice was confined to the "sons of Aaron." The Priestly Code provides that the sacrificial animal may be either male or female, but Mal. 1^{14} mentions only the male. The regulations regarding the tithes (3^{8-10}) are nearer to the law of the Priestly Code, indeed, than to that of Deuteronomy, in that they contemplate the payment of all the tithes at Jerusalem, whereas Deuteronomy requires a triennial tithe to be paid over to the Levites and the poor in their city gates, where they are to eat it. This departure from Deuteronomy in Malachi is explicable on two grounds. In the first place, it is quite probable that in the time of Malachi all the Levites were living in Jerusalem itself or in its immediate vicinity; in the second place, the Priestly Code was not created wholly *ex nihilo*. There were preparatory stages of development; for

* So *e. g.* Hd., Pres., Schegg.

† So *e. g.* Köh.; Stei.; Kö.[Einl.]; Or.; Volck, in *PRE.*[3]; Dr.[Int.], 357.

‡ So *e. g.* Rosenm., Ew., Ke., Hengstenberg, Reinke, Kue.

example, the Holiness Code and Ez., chs. 40–48. Consequently, with customs and rites continually undergoing modification, it is more than probable that the Priestly Code, in the matter of tithes as in many other respects, did but recognise officially what custom had already approved. Malachi thus represents a stage in the history of tithing midway between that of Deuteronomy on the one hand and the Priestly Code on the other. The tithing called for by Malachi seems less elaborate and complicated than that arranged for in Ne. $10^{37.38}$. Likewise, Malachi joins the heave-offering (תְּרוּמָה) with the tithe as in Deuteronomy, while the Priestly Code separates the two, assigning the former to the priests, as distinguished from the Levites in general. Even 4^4, the later addition, uses Deuteronomic terminology, viz. in locating the law-giving at Horeb, rather than Sinai, and in employing the phrase "statutes and judgments." It seems safe and just, therefore, to give to Malachi some credit for aid in preparing the way for the reform. The book voices the thought of one who remained true to the old ideals and customs, at a time when those around him were rapidly losing faith and becoming desperate. The attempt of Spoer to interpret the utterances of Malachi as a protest against the reform, at least in so far as it deals with priests and Levites and with divorce, can hardly be considered as other than fantastic.

§ 3. THE PROPHET.

The Book of Malachi is an anonymous writing. The name "Malachi" is apparently one attached to the book by an editor. It owes its origin to 3^1. As the name stands, it can only mean "my messenger." This is a very unlikely appellation for a parent to bestow upon a child. It might, however, be an abbreviated form of Malachiah (מלאכיה; *cf.* אבי, of 2 K. 18^2 with אביה, of 2 Ch. 29^1); in which case, the translation best supported by the analogy of similar formations would be "Yahweh is a messenger." This is clearly an improbable meaning. Thus the meaning "the messenger of Yahweh" is necessitated for the supposititious longer form. This, too, is hardly a probable name

for a child, but suggests an allusion to 3^1 (*cf.* 2^7). For further considerations opposed to the treatment of "Malachi" as a veritable name, *v.* pp. 18 *f.*.

The book being anonymous, nothing can be known of the author beyond what the book itself may reveal as to his character and temperament. Jerome testifies that the Jews of his day identified "Malachi" with Ezra,* as does the Targum. The book has been assigned by tradition to various other authors; for example, Zerubbabel and Nehemiah. Pseudo-Epiphanius declares Malachi to have been a man of Sopha in Zebulun and to have been characterised by an angelic form and appearance.† Not content with this, tradition has made him a Levite and a member of the "Great Synagogue" and has declared him to have died while still young. But these and similar traditions are all of late origin, fanciful and contradictory in character, and without any historical value as witnesses to the life of our prophet.

His prophecy shows him to have been a patriotic Jew, loving his country and his people passionately and hating the enemies of Israel fervently. He can think of no more convincing proof of Yahweh's love for Israel than the fact that Edom has recently been stricken down in accordance with Yahweh's will. Jerusalem is the city and Israel the people that Yahweh loves and intends to make the one envied by all the beholding nations. He is also evidently a man of vigorous personality and strong convictions. While others tremble and doubt, he stands brave and firm. His faith is equal to the removal of any mountain. He never entertains the possibility of Yahweh failing his people at any point; the failure is all on Israel's side. The trials and discouragements that overturn the faith of others do but cause him to strike root deeper into the love and power of God. He remains loyal to the old ways and the ancestral religion when others give up in despair and would exchange old faiths for new. He pleads earnestly for diligent and dignified observance of the outer forms of religion, deprecating severely the neglect and indiffer-

* *V. Praefatio in duodecim Prophetas.*

† *Vitae prophetarum*, cited in Nestle's *Marginalien*, 28 *f.*. *Cf.* similar statements by Dorotheus, Ephraem Syrus, Hesychius, and Isidorus Hisp..

ence with which they are being conducted. Yet he is no mere formalist or ritualist, but a man ethically and spiritually minded in a high degree. He does not regard ritual as an end in itself or as an *opus operatum*, but as the outer and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, the expression of faith in and devotion toward Yahweh. Its neglect indicates a lack of true religion. The very vigour of our prophet's faith shows that his religion does not lie upon the surface of his soul and that it cannot be satisfied with externalities, but is of the very essence of his life and can be content with nothing less than the presence of God. In this respect he is a true successor of the great prophets.

§ 4. THE MESSAGE OF MALACHI.

The task of this unknown prophet was to rekindle the fires of faith in the hearts of a discouraged people. Ezekiel and the author of Is. chs. 40–55 had kept alive the faith of the exiles by assurances of the speedy approach of deliverance and by promises of the establishment of the coming kingdom of God. Ezekiel had been so sure of this as to prepare a set of regulations for the guidance of the citizens of the coming kingdom. Deliverance came in some measure; but the dawn of the Messianic age was delayed. Fading hopes were revived by the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah. Under the spur of their enthusiasm, the temple was rebuilt and faith was quickened. All obstacles to the coming of the kingdom being now removed, the prophets and the people looked confidently for the appearance of the longed-for Golden Age. They went so far, indeed, as to identify Zerubbabel with the expected Messiah and to crown him in recognition of his right (Zc. 6^{9-15}). But the Messianic age still delayed its coming. The hopes centred in Zerubbabel were dissipated and shattered. The glowing pictures of Haggai and Zechariah were not realised. The first zeal for the new temple rapidly cooled. Israel was apparently as far from exaltation to influence and power now as she had ever been. What ground was there for encouragement or hope? Why continue denying oneself in order that the temple-

services might be properly maintained? Yahweh apparently had no interest in his people or in the vindication of justice and righteousness. Was the service of Yahweh worth while? Did it yield tangible and satisfactory returns to its adherents?

In the midst of such conditions and amid such sentiments, the writer of Malachi prepared his *apologia* in behalf of Yahweh. He must accomplish two things at least, viz. furnish a satisfactory explanation of the delay in the fulfilment of Israel's expectations and re-establish confidence in Yahweh and in the speedy coming of his Messiah. The first of these he seeks to achieve by the genuinely prophetic method of transferring the responsibility for the delay from the shoulders of Yahweh to those of Israel herself. The sins of Israel render it inconceivable that the blessing of Yahweh should rest upon her as she now is. Just as Haggai and Zechariah had insisted upon the rebuilding of the temple as the only way to the favour of Yahweh, so our prophet demands certain definite and tangible action as a prerequisite to the coming of the desired good. The corrupt and careless priesthood must mend its ways and return to the ideal condition that prevailed in ancient times when true teaching was in the priest's mouth, unrighteousness was not found upon his lips, and by his blameless life he turned many away from iniquity. His conduct now is an insult to his God. The sacrifices and offerings must be kept up to proper form and quality. The neglect of these is an unpardonable offence. No gifts will be forthcoming from Yahweh so long as the tithes and offerings due him are withheld. If Israel will but discharge its obligations to the full, Yahweh may be counted upon to fulfil all his promises made through the prophets.

Notwithstanding the emphasis and insistence of the prophet upon these external phases of the religious life, he is not on that account to be accused of a shallow conception of religion. He deplores the neglect and contempt of these things, not on the score that they themselves are essential to the well-being of God, or of themselves have any value whatever in his eyes; but on the ground that the neglect is a symptom of a state of mind and heart that is anything but pleasing to God. It reveals a lack

of reverence, faith and love that is a prime defect in Israel's religious life. The people and the priests care so little for Yahweh that they do not observe his requirements regarding ritual. The truly pious must do the whole will of God with his whole heart.

The genuinely inward element in the religion of Malachi is also shown in the further demands for reform which it urges. The old prophetic protest against social injustice sounds forth again in 3^5, showing that the ethical interests so characteristic of earlier prophecy lay near to the heart of this prophet also. A special phase of this protest is the denunciation of the common practice in accordance with which Jewish husbands divorce their Jewish wives and take wives from the surrounding non-Jewish families in their place. The cruelty toward the divorced wife that is involved is clearly realised and keenly resented by the prophet. He does not hesitate to characterise the procedure as treachery on the part of the offender toward his own people. But, more than this, it is treachery to Yahweh. It brings into the heart of the Jewish family those who have no interest in or care for the things of Yahweh. It involves the birth of half-breed children, who will be under the dominating influence of mothers who serve not Yahweh. It means the contamination of Jewish religious life at its source, by the introduction of heathen rites and beliefs. If the worship of Yahweh is to continue in Israel, or the favour of Yahweh to be poured out upon Israel, the intermarriage of Jews and non-Jews must cease. Israel, as the people of the holy God, must keep herself holy. No contact with unholy people or things can be endured. But the adherents of other gods are at the farthest possible remove from being holy to Yahweh. Hence, Israel must break off completely all such idolatrous connections.

The prophet's demands involve a complete change of heart and attitude on Israel's part. This is the indispensable condition for the coming of the Messianic age. The lack of this requisite attitude of obedience and trust is the all-sufficient explanation for the withholding of Yahweh's favour and for the delay in the coming of the Messianic kingdom. But the further task remained

for the prophet, viz. that of rekindling such faith and hope as would furnish the motive-power for the institution and execution of the desired reforms and so render possible the granting by Yahweh of the longings of the pious. Our prophet makes no effort to demonstrate the validity of his hope for the future or to point out signs of the coming of the kingdom. Faith comes not by reason. He contents himself with the ardent affirmation and reiteration of his own firm conviction. He would warm their hearts by the contagious enthusiasm of his own spirit. Whether or not his hopes were kindled by the course of contemporary history, we do not know. The author of Is., chs. 40–55, was aroused by the tidings of the triumphant career of Cyrus. The appearance of Haggai and Zechariah was coincident with the revolts throughout the Persian Empire upon the death of Cambyses and the accession of Darius. The defeat of Persia by Greece at Marathon (490 B.C.), Thermopylae and Salamis (480 B.C.), and Plataea (479 B.C.), with the revolt of Egypt aided by the Greeks (460 B.C.), may have awakened expectations in the soul of our prophet. But such external stimuli and supports were not indispensable to the prophets. They continually made the sheer venture of faith. Our author shows himself capable of such venture in his prediction of the forerunner who is to prepare the way for the coming of Yahweh. That his thought moves in the realm of spiritual agencies rather than in that of political forces is also seen in his conception of the coming of Yahweh as sudden and as overwhelming in its destructive and purificatory effect. In keeping with the trend of post-exilic thought, he sets his whole mind upon the coming of the Messiah and his kingdom. This kingdom, which is to be above all the kingdoms of the world, needs not the assistance of any earthly power to establish itself in its rightful place. Yahweh himself will bring it into its own.

The problem that confronted the author of Malachi and his contemporaries was not new in Israel. It was the ever-recurring question as to why the fortunes of Israel were not commensurate with her position as the people of God. How could the justice of God be demonstrated and vindicated in view of the disasters

that continually befell his people? Why should other nations constantly triumph at the expense of the people of God? The prophets all agree with the people that Yahweh's nation ought to prosper to an extent far surpassing all other nations. The prophets part company with the people in accounting for the discrepancy between Israel's lot and Israel's due as caused by the enormity of Israel's sins. Let these be removed and the desired harmony between external fortune and spiritual birthright will be at once established. The author of Malachi agrees in this with all his predecessors. Like them, he conceives of piety as entitled to its material rewards. He is sure that, if those rewards are not bestowed in the existing dispensation, they will be forthcoming in full measure in the Messianic age. The thought that piety is its own reward, that God is his own best gift, finds no expression from him. But, at a time when faith was wavering, he met his contemporaries on their own ground, and thrilled their hearts with the assurance that the dawn of the Golden Age was at hand. Not only so, but he also made this mighty eschatological hope operative in the betterment of the moral and religious conditions of his own day.

§ 5. LITERATURE ON THE BOOK OF MALACHI.

1. *Commentaries.*

The more important modern commentaries are those of Reinke (1856), Köhler (1865), Ewald (1868), Hitzig-Steiner (1881), Orelli (1888; 3d ed. 1908), Wellhausen (1892; 3d ed. 1898), Nowack (1897; 2d ed. 1903), G. A. Smith (1898), Marti (1903), Driver (1906), van Hoonacker (1908), and Isopescul (1908).

To be classified with these are: Halévy's translation and notes in *Revue sémitique* for 1909; Marti's translation and notes in Kautzsch's *Heilige Schrift*, ed. 3 (1910); Duhm's translation in *Die Zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt* (1910), with the accompanying notes in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. XXXI (1911); Kent's trans-

lation, with notes, in *Sermons, Epistles and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets* (1910); and P. Riessler, *Die Kleinen Propheten oder das Zwölfprophetenbuch nach dem Urtext übersetzt und erklärt* (1911).

2. *Introductions.*

The general "Introductions" to the Old Testament all treat the Book of Malachi. The more important are those of Driver (new ed. 1910), Cornill (6th ed. 1908; English ed. 1907), König (1893), Strack (6th ed. 1906), Kuenen (1889), Wildeboer (3d ed. 1903), Gautier (1906), R. Cornely (*Historicae et criticae introductionis in libros sacros compendium* [1909]), and K. Budde (*Geschichte der alt-hebräischen Litteratur* [1906]).

Special introductions and treatments of special topics are: W. R. Smith and C. C. Torrey, art. "Malachi," *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1902); A. C. Welch, art. "Malachi," Hastings's *Dictionary of the Bible* (1901); Volck, art. "Maleachi," *Protestantische Real-encyklopädie*, 3d ed. (1905); W. H. Bennett, *The Religion of the Post-exilic Prophets* (1907), pp. 88–102; Böhme, "Zu Maleachi und Haggai," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. VII (1887), pp. 210–217; H. Spoer, "Some New Considerations towards the Dating of the Book of Malachi," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. XX (1908), pp. 167–186; von Bulmerincq, *Der Ausspruch über Edom im Buche Maleachi* (1906); P. Kleinert, *Die Profeten Israels in sozialer Beziehung* (1905), pp. 129 *ff*.; C. C. Torrey, "The Prophecy of Malachi," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. XVII (1898), pp. 1–15; H. Winckler, *Altorientalische Forschungen*, vol. II (1899), pp. 531–539; B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. II (1888), pp. 128–138; *Idem*, *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, vol. I (1905), pp. 332–335.

3. *Miscellaneous.*

Ed. Sievers, "Alttestamentliche Miscellen, No. 4," in *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften* [Philologisch-historische Klasse], vol. LVII (1905). D. H. Müller, "Discours de Malachie," *Revue biblique*

for 1896, pp. 535-539 (=*Strophenbau und Responsion* [1898], pp. 40-45). Joh. Bachmann, *Dodekapropheton aethiopium;* Heft 2—*Der Prophet Maleachi* (1892). A. Schulte, "Die Koptische Uebersetzung der Kleinen Propheten untersucht," *Theologische Quartalschrift*, vol. LXXVII (1895), pp. 219-229. K. Budde, "Zum Texte der drei letzten Propheten," *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, vol. XXVI (1906). F. Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter* (1893). T. Nöldeke, art. "Edom," *Encyclopædia Biblica* (1901). W. von Baudissin, art. "Edom," *Protestantische Real-encyklopädie*, 3d ed. (1898). Ed. Meyer, *Die Entstehung des Judenthums* (1896), pp. 105-119. C. C. Torrey, "The Edomites in Southern Judah," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, vol. XVII (1898), pp. 16-20. Graetz, "Die Anfänge der Nabatäerherrschaft," *Monatsschrift für Wissenschaft und Geschichte des Judenthums*, for 1875, pp. 60-66.

A COMMENTARY ON THE BOOK OF MALACHI.

§ 1. THE SUPERSCRIPTION (1^1).

The superscription states the ultimate source of the prophecy, the people to whom it is addressed, and the agent of its transmission. The superscription of no prophetic book offers less of genuine information; those of Obadiah and Habakkuk are its only rivals in this respect.

The editorial origin of this superscription is now quite generally conceded. This opinion is supported by the close resemblance in form between this superscription and those in Zc. 9^1 12^1, which are likewise of editorial origin. It is probable that all three were written by the same hand; or, at least, that two of them were modelled after the third one. The structure is too unusual to make it likely that they were of independent origin (*v. i.*).

1. *Oracle of the word of Yahweh to Israel*] For the use of the word "oracle," *v.* note on Na. 1^1 in *ICC*.. This and Zc. 9^1 12^1 are the only passages in which "oracle" is followed by "word," though "oracle of Yahweh" and "word of Yahweh" are common phrases. "Israel" here represents the Jewish community as the people of God for whom all the ancient promises and expectations are to be realised.—*Through Malachi*] The source of this statement is evidently 3^1, where "Malachi" is not a proper name, but the equivalent of "my messenger" or "my angel." 𝔊 renders here "through his messenger." 𝔗 likewise treats it as a common noun, rather than as a proper name.—For the personality and character of the prophet, *v.* Introduction, § 3; and for the time of his activity, *v.* Introduction, § 2.

1. אל] 𝔊 *ἐπί* = עַל, as in Zc. 12^1; so 𝔖 𝔗.—מַלְאָכִי] 𝔊 *ἀγγέλου αὐτοῦ* = מלאכו; so Bu.. 𝔗 renders *my angel whose name is called Ezra, the scribe.* Against the treatment of מ׳ as a *bona-fide* name may be urged (1) the fact that the name is not found elsewhere, though מלאך is a common

word; (2) the lack of any definite information concerning such a man; (3) the improbability that any parent would bestow such a name upon an infant; (4) the absence of any early tradition treating it as a proper name (*cf.* 𝔊 𝔗). If it were a proper name, the affix י might be either an abbreviation of יה, or an adjectival ending. *Cf.* אורי and אוריה; אֲבִי and אֲבִיָּה; פלטי and פלטיאל, etc.; *v.* Nö., art. "Names," § 52, *EB*.. The anonymous author has been variously identified; *e. g.* as Ezra (𝔗, Jer., Calvin); as Mordecai (Rabbi Nachman); as Haggai (various rabbis; perhaps also the view of the editor who added a citation from Hg. in 𝔊); as Joshua, son of Jozedek (Clement of Alexandria); and as an angel (Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostom). The earliest witnesses to the interpretation of מ' as a proper name are 𝔖, Θ, Σ, 𝔙 and the title of the book in 𝔊.

𝔊 adds here: *θέσθε δὴ ἐπὶ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν*. $𝔖^{H}$ has it under obelus. Jer. says, "Hoc in Hebraico non habetur, sed puto de Aggaeo additum in quo legimus: et nunc ponite super corda vestra, etc.". This supposition is probably correct, for $𝔊^{א\ c.\ b.\ AQΓ}$ have the same rendering in Hg. 2^{15} as 𝔊 here. $𝔊^{B}$ substitutes *εἰς* for *ἐπί* in Hg.; *cf.* 𝔊 on Mal. 2^{2}. 𝔐 of Hg. 2^{15} = שימו נא לבבכם; hence Gr. would restore שימו נא על לבבכם here. Bach. finds in this gloss from 𝔊 the otherwise unknown name of the prophet, by supposing 𝔊 to represent וְשִׂימוּ בְּלֵב, the original of which was וּשְׂמוֹ כָּלֵב. But שימו בלב is not good Hebrew, which would require either ש' על לב, or שימו לב על as in Hg. 2^{15}. *Cf.* Matthes, *ZAW*. XXIII (1903), 126 *f*.. For a similar marginal citation from another book, *v.* the quotation from Mi. 1^{2} in 1 K. 22^{28}.

§ 2. A PROOF OF YAHWEH'S LOVE (1^{2-5}).

In this opening section the prophet meets the lament of his people that Yahweh has ceased to love Judah, by reminding them of the recent overthrow of Edom, their hated foe, as an evidence of the love that they are calling in question. This reference to the fate of Edom would seem to fix the date of this prophecy; but unfortunately the information here is too vague and our knowledge of the later history of Edom too incomplete to render any degree of certainty as to this question possible; *v.* Introduction, § 2. These verses really state the theme of the whole book; for the writer's task is that of showing Israel, on the one hand, that Yahweh loves her and, on the other, that her own sinful conduct prevents her from enjoying the full fruitage of that love.

2. *I have loved you, says Yahweh*] The tense of the verb indicates a love that has not only operated in the past, but is also in effect at the present. This is the proposition that the prophet seeks to establish. It was not a new idea in any sense, but had been the accepted teaching regarding Yahweh's attitude toward his own people for centuries; *cf.* Ho. 11^{1} Dt. 7^{7} 10^{15} Ez. 16. The trouble was that at this time the people had lost faith in Yahweh's love. They had become skeptical.—*But you say, Wherein hast thou loved us?*] Under the form of question and answer, a characteristic feature of the style of this prophecy, the prophet carries on an argument with his readers. *Cf.* $1^{6.\,7}$ 2^{17} $3^{7.\,8.\,13}$; the same usage appears in germ in Je. $13^{12\,ff.}$ $15^{1\,f.}$, while Zc., chs. 1–8, makes much use of the question and answer as a means to secure vividness. The question here on Israel's part calls for a bill of particulars from the prophet. What evidence has he that Yahweh still loves his people? Do not the facts indicate that he has ceased to care for their interests? This state of mind in Judah was due largely to their long-continued sufferings and to their repeated disappointments. The people had returned from exile with the full expectation of the immediate coming of the Messianic kingdom. They had been spurred on to the rebuilding of the temple by similar promises from Haggai and Zechariah. But the kingdom had not come; the power of Persia was still unbroken. The lot of Judah was one of hardship and oppression. Since the responsibility for this condition must be borne by Yahweh, the only conclusion to which the discouraged people could come was that Yahweh no longer loved them. The prophet's reply to their demand for evidence to the contrary was immediate and direct.—*Is not Esau a brother of Jacob? It is the oracle of Yahweh*] Esau here represents Edom, as is shown clearly by v. ^{4}. For other cases of the same usage, *cf.* Gn. $36^{1.\,8.\,19}$ Je. $49^{8.\,10}$ Ob. ^{6}. Similarly Jacob represents the people of Judah, as also in 2^{12} Is. 41^{8} 42^{24} Je. $30^{10.\,18}$ Ps. 20^{1}, and often elsewhere. Of the various members of the Hebraic family, Edom is the only one that is ever recognised in the Old Testament as sustaining the close relationship of brother to Israel; *cf.* Am. 1^{11} Dt. 23^{8}. The very closeness of

the tie seems to have made the hostility that developed all the more bitter; *cf.* Ob. [10, 12]. As brothers, Edom and Judah were on the same footing before Yahweh. Yet he had chosen Judah rather than Edom as the object of his love. Earlier commentators saw here evidence of the doctrine of predestination.* But it is clear that the writer had no such thought in mind. He was merely concerned to indicate clearly that the choice of Judah was an act of free grace on the part of Yahweh; he had been under no constraint to choose as he had done. On the concluding phrase, with which the divine authority of the statement is asserted, *v.* H.[AH], p. 59.—*But I have loved Jacob* (**3**) *and hated Esau*] The love for Jacob is demonstrated by the hatred toward Esau, convincing evidence of which is forthcoming. This reflection of the feelings of Judah toward Edom is a clear indication of the post-exilic origin of the prophecy. The bitterness of Judah toward Edom grew increasingly intense in the post-exilic period. The insults and injuries inflicted by Edom at the time of the Babylonian captivity rankled in the memory of Judah and constituted a source whence increased significance was drawn and attached to every fresh injury, fancied or real. The constant encroachment of Edom upon Jewish territory, made necessary by the unceasing advance of the Nabataeans, kept the hostility continually alive. A love for Judah that did not involve corresponding hatred for Edom was unthinkable. The humiliation and downfall of Edom was an indispensable accompaniment of the coming of the Messianic age; *cf.* Ob. [18-21] Is. $34^{5, 6}$ 63^{1-6} Je. $49^{13, 17, 18}$. The older interpreters,† hesitating to make the prophet ascribe such feelings to Yahweh, sought to make "hate" mean "love less." But it is a question, not of degrees of love, but of love or no love. Hebrew prophets had no scruples about ascribing their own deepest convictions and feelings to Yahweh.—*And I have made his mountains a desolation and his inheritance pastures in the wilderness*] The last phrase occurs also in Je. 9^{10} 23^{10} Jo. $1^{19, 20}$ 2^{22} Ps. 65^{12}. 𝔐 has here in its place "to jackals of the wilderness"; but this does not form a satisfactory completion of "I have made his inheritance." 𝔐 requires either the insertion of a second verb, *e. g.* "and I have

* *E. g.* Calvin. † *E. g.* J. H. Michaelis, Dathe, Rosenm..

given his inheritance to," etc.; or the use of the verb "made" in two different senses, viz. "I have made his mountains a desolation and I have put (or placed) his inheritance for the jackals," etc.. But the oldest witnesses to the original rendering of 𝔊, including 𝔖, support the reading here adopted. The prophet here in all probability refers to some calamity that has recently befallen Edom and cites it as indisputable evidence of Yahweh's love for Judah. As to the historical event he may have had in mind, *v.* Introduction, § 2.—**4.** *If Edom says, We are beaten down, but we will rebuild the ruins*] The prophet now meets the objection that the overthrow of Edom is not final, but only for the moment. "She has fallen before," says Judah, "but only to rise again."—*Thus says Yahweh of hosts*] The word of Yahweh is set over against the word of Edom, in paralysing contrast. This title is the most frequent designation of Yahweh in this prophecy, occurring no less than twenty-one times. On its usage and significance, *cf.* H.^{AH}, pp. 83 *f.*.—*They may build, but I shall tear down*] The futility of their efforts as opposed to Yahweh's will is thus clearly brought into view. The destruction already accomplished is fatal. There can be no permanent recovery from it.—*And men will call them, "wicked country"*] The smitten state of Edom will be convincing proof to all that she was preeminently wicked. This is the view of the old theology, shared by all the prophets, viz. that disaster and suffering are always caused by sin and that the greater the affliction, the greater must have been the sin that caused it. The term "wicked" here probably includes much of the bitterness and contempt associated with its use in the mind of the members of the later Jewish community. Among these, it came to be a technical epithet opposed to the term "pious" (חסיד) which was applied to those loyal to Yahweh and faithful in their adherence to all the tenets of the law. The "wicked," however, were those who apostatised from Yahwism or persecuted the followers of Yahweh. Such were the Edomites in very fact.—*And "the people against whom Yahweh is angry perpetually"*] This is another epithet which men will apply to Edom. Its ruins will be a standing witness to the abiding wrath of God. Some scholars, striving to make this material conform to metrical standards, would omit

the last phrase "for ever" or "perpetually." But this is the essential element in the sentence. The prophet's purpose is to convince Judah that Edom's overthrow is final, not a mere temporary disaster due to a passing fit of anger on the part of Yahweh.—**5.** *And your eyes will see and you yourselves will say*] The proof of Yahweh's love and power is not to be indefinitely postponed, but will come with crushing force within the lifetime of the prophet's contemporaries. As each successive attempt of the Edomites to re-establish themselves is thwarted by Yahweh, they will come to realise the range and scope of Yahweh's purpose and the effectual working of his love. What they themselves shall see will lead them to say—"*Yahweh is great above the territory of Israel*"] Judah will be at length convinced that Yahweh has not forsaken his people. The rendering of this sentence which is now generally adopted is "Yahweh is great beyond the border of Israel";* that is, Yahweh's power is recognised as extending to nations other than Israel. But at the time when this prophecy was written, there was little question in Judah as to the extent of Yahweh's power. The question rather was as to his love for and interest in Israel. Hence, what is needed here is a statement expressing the thought that Yahweh has convincingly demonstrated his love for Israel. Further, the prepositional phrase rendered "beyond" nowhere else has that sense. It occurs in Gn. 1^7 1 S. 17^{39} Ez. 1^{25} Jon. 4^6 Ne. $12^{31.\ 37.\ 39}$ 2 Ch. 13^4 24^{20} 26^{19}, and it always means "over," "above," or "upon." The prophet pictures Yahweh as enthroned over Israel in majesty and power and attracting the wonder and reverence of the world at large. The Messianic age for which Israel has so long looked in vain is thus to come within the lifetime of the prophet's audience.

2. אהבתי] Present pf.; Ges. §$^{106\ g}$.—ואמרתם] Pf. with waw conjunctive, co-ordinate with the preceding present pf..—נאם י׳] The only occurrence of this phrase in Mal.. Marti adds צבאות *mtr. cs.*; so Now.^{K}, Kent. But אמר י׳ in ^{2a} lacks צ׳, and metrical considerations have no force in prose. Böh. drops נ׳ י׳ as a gloss; so Siev., Bu.. But in a writing which cites divine authority as frequently as Mal. does, the

* So *e. g.* Rosenm., Mau., Hi., Ew., Umbreit, Reinke, Schegg, We., Now., GASm., Marti, Dr., Or., van H., Hal., Du.^{Pro}. *Cf.* Hd., "Let Y. be magnified from the border of Israel." "Above" is preferred by Ke., Köh., Pu., Bulmerincq.

closeness of 'נ' י to the foregoing 'אמר י is no reason for suspecting the text; *cf.* $1^{8.\,9.\,10.\,11}$.—ואהב את יעקב] 𝔊^{ℵ} adds λέγει κύριος. In 𝔊 and in the quotation of this and the following phrase in Rom. 9^{13}, the vbs. are rendered by the aorist.—**3.** לְתַנּוֹת] Rd. נְוֹת (= נְאוֹת; *cf.* Zp. 2^{6} Je. 9^{9} Ez. 25^{5} Ps. 65^{13}), dropping לת as dittog. from the preceding word; so Torrey, SS., Now.(?), van H., Kent. The reading לִנְוֹת (= לִנְאוֹת) was proposed by Capellus (*Com. et not. crit.* [1698], p. 183); so also Böh., Sta.$^{GVI.\ 112}$, Gr., Du.$^{Pro.}$. נוֹת is supported by the reading εἰς δώματα in the oldest witnesses to the text of 𝔊; viz. 𝔖^{H} 𝔈$^{Bo.}$, and also by 𝔖 which renders it by "dwellings." The Comp. and Sixtine edd. also have δώματα. 𝔊^{ABℵ}, HP. 95, 185, 310, 𝔄, Arm. have εἰς δόματα, certainly an error for δώματα. Aq. εἰς σειρῆνας. 𝔙 *dracones*. Σ, Θ, εἰς ἀνεπίβατα. 𝔗 *unto desolation*. Oort *del.* תנות as dittog., reading לְמִדְבָּר. Che. לְשִׁירוֹת. Marti treats לתנות as a corruption of נָתַתִּי לְ; so Siev., Bu.; so apparently Eth., which certainly does not recognise the presence of תנות. Bulmerincq, לְמְעוֹן תַּנִּין, with מדבר as an explanatory gloss. For נְוֹת, *v.* note on Zp. 2^{6} in *ICC*.. Scholars who retain תנות, which is ἅπ., treat it either as a fem. pl. corresponding to תַּנִּים (so AE., Köh., Ke.) or as connected with Ar. *tana'a* and so contracted from תַּנְאוֹת = "dwellings" (so Ges. in *Thesaurus*); but neither the noun nor the root appears elsewhere in OT..—**4.** כי] With conditional force, as in Dt. 14^{24} 1 S. $20^{12.\,13}$ Pr. 30^{4}; so 𝔖 𝔗 𝔙.—תאמר] Pl. in 𝔖 𝔗. Bu. יֹאמַר (?). The form is better taken as a 3d fem. sg. than as 2d masc. sg., though אדום is usually treated as a masc.. But names of countries regularly take the fem. and it is the country personified that is spoken of here; *cf.* also Je. 35^{11} 36^{5} Ez. 32^{29}.—רששנו] 𝔊 κατέστραπται; *cf.* καταστρέψω for אחרוס. 𝔖 𝔗 = *we are made poor*, as a Polal from ריש = "be needy." Its only other occurrence is as Poel in Je. 5^{17} (where text is doubtful); hence Now. would point as Poal here. Syr. *raš* = "strike with the hammer" and Ar. *raṭṭa* = "be beaten" are related roots, as likewise Heb. רצץ and רסס. The fact that it is used of buildings in Je. 5^{17} does not prevent its use here, in a figurative sense, of a country or people; *contra* We..—נשוב] 'ש is often used to express the idea of *re*-doing a thing as here.—וקראו] The 3d p. pl. act. used indefinitely, as the equivalent of a pass.; *cf.* 𝔊 ἐπικληθήσεται. It is unnecessary to change to וְנִקְרָא, with Marti.—רשעה] A noun in gen. with a cstr. to express an adjectival idea; Ges. $^{\S\ 128\ p}$.—עד־עולם] Omitted *m.cs.* by Siev., Marti., Now.^{K}, Kent; but *v. s.*.—**5.** יגדל] 𝔊 ἐμεγαλύνθη. 𝔙 *magnificetur;* so 𝔖. Hal. הִגְדִּיל = "has done great things." 'נ here is = "is glorified" or "has shown his greatness"; *cf.* Ps. 35^{27} 40^{17} 70^{5}.—מעל] The rendering of 𝔊 ὑπεράνω and 𝔙 *super* is better than that of 𝔖 𝔗 = *beyond; v. s.*. The regular idioms for "beyond" are מן . . . ומעלה (Ju. 1^{36} 1 S. 9^{2} 16^{13} Ex. 30^{14}), למעלה (Ezr. 9^{6}), and בעבר (Dt. *passim*).—נבול] 𝔊 pl..

§ 3. YAHWEH HONOURS THEM THAT HONOUR HIM (1^{6}–2^{9}).

Having shown in § 2 that there was no warrant for continuing to doubt the love of Yahweh toward his people, the prophet now proceeds to indicate the causes that make it impossible for Yahweh to let this love have full sway. Starting with the general principle that a people must show honour toward its God, he charges Israel with heaping dishonour upon Yahweh by indifference, carelessness, and deception in the bringing of its sacrificial gifts (1^{6-9}). No sacrifice at all were better than this (1^{10}). In the heathen world, due reverence is shown to Yahweh; but in his own city and temple he is treated with contempt. For blemished animals are substituted for sound and healthy ones which alone are suitable for sacrifice. Hence curses rather than blessings must be the lot of such worshippers (1^{11-14}). It is especially incumbent upon the priests, the ministers of Yahweh, to see to it that he is fitly honoured in the proper conduct of the ritual. Failure to secure this will bring upon them a terrible curse for their unfaithfulness to the covenant between them and Yahweh. In days gone by, the priesthood lived up to the full measure of its responsibility; but now, they are leaders in wickedness rather than in righteousness. Consequently, the low esteem in which they are now generally held is the due reward of their conduct as perverters of the law (2^{1-9}).

6. *A son honours his father*] Reverence for parents was an outstanding Semitic virtue; *cf.* Dt. 5^{16} 21^{18-21} and the Code of Hammurabi, §§ 186, 192, 193, 195. The term "fatherhood," according to Semitic usage, connotes authority rather than love, though the latter is by no means excluded.*—*And a servant fears his master*] The word "fears" is supplied upon the basis of 𝔊. The verbs "honour" and "fear" express their customary meanings. These are the relations that usually obtain and should obtain between fathers and sons, masters and servants. The word "servant" may denote either a free servant or a slave. The

* *Cf.* GASm..

latter certainly had good reason to fear his master; *cf.* Ex. 21[20 f.] [26 f.] and the Code of Hammurabi, §§ 197–199, 205, 210, 214, 217, etc..—*But if I be a father, where is my honour? And if I be a master, where is my reverence?*] The honour and reverence due to Yahweh from his people have not been rendered to him. The idea of the worshipper as the "slave" or "servant" of Yahweh was one of long standing in Israel; *cf.* 3[14] Zp. 3[9] 1 S. 3[9] 1 K. 8[66] Ex. 3[12] 9[1] Ezr. 5[11]. The conception of Yahweh as the "father" of his people was also not new with this prophet; *v.* Ho. 11[1] Ex. 4[22 f.] Je. 3[4] Is. 43[6]. *Cf.* Is. 9[6] 63[16] 64[8] Ps. 68[5] 89[26] 103[13]. On the deity as an object of fear, *cf.* Gn. 31[53].—*Says Yahweh of hosts to you, O priests, who despise my name*] This is the favourite title of God in this prophecy; *v.* on v.[4]; hence there is no sufficient reason for dropping "of hosts" here as some do for the sake of a supposititious metre. The priests, who of all men should have held Yahweh in honour, are charged with holding his name in contempt. The "name" and the personality were so closely associated in Hebrew thought as to be almost identical.* To despise the "name," therefore, was to despise Yahweh himself.—*But you say, How have we despised thy name?*] This question opens the way for a bill of particulars; *cf.* v.[2]. Concrete facts are now called for.—**7.** *In bringing upon my altar polluted food*] In Ez. 44[7], the fat and the blood are called the food of Yahweh; *cf.* Lv. 3[11. 16] 21[6-8. 17. 21. 22] 22[25] Nu. 28[2]. The same idea holds here as is clear from v.[8]. That the show-bread is not meant is clear from the fact that the "food" is presented upon the "altar," whereas the show-bread was laid upon a special table. The nature of the pollution or defilement also is indicated in v.[8]. The solicitude of this writer in behalf of the proper observance of the sacrificial ritual is in striking contrast with the attitude of the prophets of the eighth century B.C.; *e. g.* Am. 4[5] 5[21-25] Ho. 6[6] Is. 1[11-16]. Yet, it must be borne in mind that this prophet's indignation was aroused, not because of the neglect of sacrifice *per se*, but because of the indifference toward Yahweh that it reflected. The religion of the day was a hollow form; there was no deep conviction or uplifting devotion in it.—*But you say, How have*

* *Cf.* F. Giesebrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens* (1901), 17 *f.*, 67 *f.*, 88 *f.*.

we polluted it?] 𝕸 reads "thee" for "it"; but this is virtually to repeat the question of v. [6] and it presupposes the charge of having polluted Yahweh himself, which is hardly thinkable. Hence, it is better to read "it" with 𝕲 𝕿. This is better than to omit the phrase,* or to drop merely "and you say" and transpose the question to the end of v. [6].†—*In that you say, The table of Yahweh is contemptible*] This is rather a sentiment which the prophet ascribes to them than a statement which they have actually made. Interpreting their attitude by their actions, this is the state of mind in which he finds them. For other instances of "say" in the sense "say to oneself" *i. e.* "think," *v.* Ex. 2^{14} 2 S. 21^{16} 2 K. 5^{11}. The priests had evidently come to regard it as of little consequence whether the sacrifices were properly conducted or not. The term "table of Yahweh" occurs only here and in v. [12]. It may apply to the table of show-bread (Ex. 25^{30} 1 K. 7^{48} Nu. 4^{7}), but it is more probably a general term here, including that table and the altar (Ez. 41^{22} 44^{16}). The use of such a term is a survival from the time when the sacrifice was thought of as a meal of which the Deity partook along with his worshippers.—**8.** *And when you bring the blind to sacrifice, is there no harm? And when you bring the lame and the sick, is there no harm?*] Law and custom required that every sacrificial victim should be free from spot or blemish, sound in every particular; *v.* Dt. 15^{21} 17^{1} Lv. $22^{18\,ff.\ 22\,ff.}$ Ex. 12^{5} 29^{1} Nu. 6^{14} 19^{2} Ez. 45^{23}. Even the ministering official himself must possess the same perfection; *v.* Lv. $21^{17\,f.}$. Requirements of this kind, it is probable, originated in the earlier days when disease and deformity were looked upon as due to the malevolent activity of demons, and persons and animals so afflicted were naturally regarded as tabu or unclean in the sight of Yahweh. But here, as the following questions show, the sacrifice is thought of as a gift to Yahweh, and the blemishes as imperfections in the gift which reflect slight regard on the part of the donor for the one to whom the gift is offered. The exact force of the last phrase is uncertain. It is most easily understood as a rhetorical question,‡ the answer to which is patent to all. But it may also be regarded as the state-

* *Contra* We., Now.. † *Contra* Bu.. ‡ So 𝕿 𝕍; 𝕲 is as ambiguous as 𝕸.

ment of a sentiment attributed to the accused priests,* the words "you say" or "you think" being understood.—*Offer it now to thy governor, will he accept it?*] How much less can Yahweh be expected to be pleased with it! 𝔐 reads "accept thee"; but the text of 𝔊 𝔙 seems preferable and is supported by 1^{10-13}. The same confusion of suffixes has occurred in 1^7. The word rendered "governor" furnishes a slight indication as to the date of the prophecy. It occurs only in exilic and post-exilic writings (viz. Je., Ez., K., Hg., Ezr., Ne., Est., and the Elephantine papyri), is probably borrowed from Assyrian, and is used only of governors appointed by foreign rulers, except in 1 K. 10^{15}, a very late addition,† where it is applied to the subordinates of Solomon. *Cf.* Introduction, § 2.—*Or will he receive you graciously?*] Lit. "lift up your face" *i. e.* make you to look up in gladness and confidence because of his kindness. The same idiom is used in 2^9, and often elsewhere, to express the idea of showing partiality. Here, however, the meaning "show favour" contains no implication of injustice.—*Says Yahweh of hosts*] There is no sufficient reason for the omission of this phrase as a gloss;‡ *cf.* vv. $^{6. 9. 10. 11. 13}$.—**9.** *And now, seek the favour of God that he may be gracious to us*] *Cf.* Zc. 7^2 Dn. 9^{13}. This is an ironical suggestion,§ as the sequel shows. The prophet includes himself as one in need of the divine favour even as those whom he addresses. The innocent are involved with the guilty in the sufferings occasioned by the sins of the latter and are consequently in equal need of the mercy of God.—*From your hand has this been*] This is a gloss,** occasioned by the pronoun at the close of the preceding sentence. Some reader, fearful lest the prophet by including himself among those in need of mercy might seem to be acknowledging that he himself was one of those responsible for the miseries of Judah, inserted this disclaimer in order that the responsibility might be placed squarely upon the shoulders of those to whom it belonged. The interruption between the implied protasis in the

* So *e. g.* Rosenm..
† So Gie. (*ZAW*. I, 233), Benzinger, Kittel, Sta. and Schwally, Kamphausen, *et al.*, *ad loc.*.
‡ *Contra* Marti, Now.[K], Siev., *et al.*.
§ It is taken as a genuine call to repentance by Hi., We., Now., *et al.*.
** So Marti, Now.[K], Siev..

previous sentence and the apodosis in the succeeding question makes its glossarial origin clear.—*Will he be gracious toward you?*] Lit. "will he lift up faces from you?", a form of the phrase nowhere else found. This rhetorical question calls for a negative answer. The conduct of the priests effectually hinders Yahweh from showing them any favour.—*Says Yahweh of hosts*] This is omitted by some as a gloss,* but without due cause; *v.* on v. [8].

With v. [10], the prophet takes a new start and represents Yahweh as entreating the priests to discontinue their sacrificial rites which are so distasteful to him.—**10.** *O, that there were some one among you to close the doors, so that you might not kindle mine altar in vain*] The double doors of the temple court are the ones meant; *cf.* Ez. $41^{23.\ 24}$. The closing of these would cut off access to the altar. The sacrifices which bulk so large in the ritual are worse than useless in Yahweh's sight as they are now performed. These words have been differently interpreted by reason of the fact that the last word has a twofold meaning, viz. "in vain" and "gratis." Hence some have seen here evidence that the priests had become too lazy and indifferent even to close the temple doors at the proper time.† Others interpret to the effect that the meanest attendant of the temple now demands a reward for the simplest action, even the closing of the doors.‡—*I have no pleasure in you, says Yahweh of hosts*] Yet the very purpose of the sacrifices was to make sure of the favour of Yahweh by affording him pleasure.—*Nor will I accept an offering from your hand*] This language recalls the sentiments of previous prophecy; *e. g.* Am. $5^{21\,f.}$ Ho. 6^{6} 8^{13} Is. $1^{11\,ff.}$. Though the particular thing to which this prophet takes exception is different from that objected to by the former prophets, yet the central interest of all is the same. They insist upon a right conception of Yahweh and a proper attitude of mind and heart toward him. Amos and his immediate successors opposed the cultus because of the superstitious and overzealous devotion of their contemporaries who failed to understand that the chief interests of Yahweh centred in other things; this prophet resents an indifference on the part of the priests which is an insult to Yahweh.—**11.** *For*

* So Marti, Now.[K], Siev.. † So *e. g.* Hesselberg, Hd.. ‡ So Jer., Grotius, Pu..

from the rising of the sun even to its setting, my name is great among the nations] The connection between this verse and the preceding is not obvious. But probably the thought is that Yahweh is not dependent upon the worshippers in Jerusalem for a right recognition of his place and power. He can refuse to receive them for he has other worshippers scattered throughout the world. The honour denied him in his own city is freely accorded him in foreign cities. The exact significance of the phrase "great among the nations" is open to question. It may mean that Yahweh is now acknowledged as God by the nations at large, who have become convinced of his superiority to other gods; or that here and there among the nations may be found groups of people who turn their backs upon idolatry and give themselves to the worship of the true God; or that, even if the Jews at home insult Yahweh, the Jews of the Dispersion are doing him honour among the nations of the earth where they have been so widely scattered. The first of these alternatives is improbable, because it is so far from accordance with the facts of history. At no time in the life of Israel could it be said with any shadow of verisimilitude that Yahweh was universally acknowledged as God. Nor is there any evidence that Judaism ever had any appreciable success among the nations at large in the propagation of its faith, even if any serious attempt at the conversion of the nations could be proven. Aside from a few idealists, like the author of Jonah, the followers of Judaism seem to have lacked any aggressive missionary spirit. What religious approach was made to the nations was apologetic rather than missionary. It was merely the response of Judaism to the necessity of justifying its own right and fitness to live alongside of the religions of the conquerors. Consequently, it is not likely that the number of proselytes was ever large enough or widely enough distributed to serve as a basis for the statement of the text. But at the time of this prophecy, the Dispersion extended from Babylonia and Persia in the East to Southern Egypt in the West. It is not at all unlikely that the standard of Yahwism was on the whole higher among the exiles than it was in Jerusalem. This was certainly true of the Babylonian exiles at least; *cf.* Je. $24^{1\,ff.}$

Ez. 6[8 ff.]. The impetus to reform and progress in Jerusalem came from without, not from within, according to all Jewish tradition. These facts make the allusion to the widely scattered Jewish community to be the most probable interpretation of the prophet's words. The view that this statement reflects the author's conviction that the gods of the heathen were only so many different names for the one great God and that the nations were therefore in reality worshipping Yahweh finds many supporters.* But against this is the following statement that incense is offered to Yahweh's *name*. Moreover, the emphasis in Malachi upon ritualism and its attitude toward mixed marriages militate strongly against the hypothesis that its author could have taken so charitable and sympathetic a view of paganism. Still another view commonly held† is that the author refers to the Messianic future when the nations will all have been brought to acknowledge Yahweh as Lord. But the contrast between the Jews and the nations is more natural when applied to the pagan world that now is than as between Judaism in the present and paganism in the future. There is no differentiation in form between v. [11] and v. [12] such as we should expect did they refer to different dispensations. The presumption of the grammar is that they both refer to the same age and, in v. [12], it is unmistakably the present. —*And in every place, smoke is made to arise to my name, and a pure offering*] Throughout the heathen world, the sacrifices are being brought to Yahweh in accordance with all the requirements of the ritual. The usual interpretation of this has been to the effect that the prophet refers to the worship of Yahweh by the heathen peoples, whose sacrifices were "pure" because not subject to the same rigid requirements as those in Jerusalem; or that he uses the word "offering" in a figurative sense, meaning thereby the prayer and praise offered to Yahweh by the non-Jewish world. Others, holding similar views as to the meaning, have made the statement apply to the coming Messianic age,‡ not to actually existing conditions. Sacrifices, on the part of

* So *e. g.* Hi., We., Torrey, Now., Marti.

† So *e. g.* Justin, Irenæus, Theodoret, Augustine, Reinke, AV., Schegg, Pu., van H., Isop..

‡ Note especially the view of Isop. that the prophet had in mind the Holy Eucharist of the Catholic Church.

Jews at least, anywhere except at the temple in Jerusalem have been until recently regarded as placed under the ban by the Deuteronomic law and therefore not to be designated as a "pure offering." But the discovery of the Elephantine papyri has changed all this. The colonists in Egypt evidently were conscious of no irregularity in the erection of a shrine to Yahweh on Egyptian soil and in the offering of sacrifices to Yahweh therein.* Nor is it altogether certain that the Jerusalem hierarchy condemned their action; the failure of the priests to respond to the request of the colonists for aid may well have been due to other reasons than disapproval of the enterprise upon ritualistic grounds. Inability to render aid, or fear of arousing the hostility of the Persian officials may have caused the disappointment to their distant fellow-countrymen. In any case, it is quite evident that the writer of this prophecy may have shared the views of the colonists as to the legitimacy of sacrificial worship upon foreign soil and may have had such shrines as that at Elephantine in mind when he wrote.† It is by no means clear that the Deuteronomic legislators intended to condemn sanctuaries on foreign soil. Their purpose was to eliminate impurity from the worship of Judah by centralising it in Jerusalem under rigid supervision. They were not legislating for exiles, if indeed they so much as contemplated the possibility of a general Diaspora. The Babylonian exile introduced a new set of conditions into the political and the religious world of Judaism. As a matter of fact, the further development of the ritual was along narrow and exclusive lines; but it was not carried through without a fierce struggle. Many devout Jews aligned themselves with the more liberal tendencies of the times, as evidenced by the books of Jonah and Ruth. Probably Malachi is to be placed in the same class in so far, at least, as the localisation of the ritual is con-

* There is no necessity for supposing that the action of these colonists in erecting a temple on foreign soil was unique. It is altogether probable that similar shrines were erected in other Jewish centres. The later temple at Heliopolis is a case in point. The same longings and needs that caused the building of the temple at Elephantine existed in many other regions and may easily have resulted in similar action. So also Torrey, *Ezra Studies*, 315 *ff*.. For a contrary view, *v.* W. R. Arnold, *JBL.*, XXXI (1912), 31 *ff*..

† So also O. C. Whitehouse, in *Transactions of Third International Congress for the History of Religions*, I (1908), 284; J. W. Rothstein, *Jüden und Samaritaner* (1908), 77 *f*.; Du. *ZAW*. XXXI (1911), 179 *f*..

cerned.—*For great is my name among the nations, says Yahweh of hosts*] There is some justification, aside from the question of metre, for holding this to be a gloss,* since it but repeats what has already been said. Yet this is not a necessary conclusion; for coming, as it does, immediately before v. [12], it furnishes an antecedent near at hand for the pronoun "it" in the latter, besides bringing the magnification of Yahweh among the nations into immediate contrast with the contrary conduct of Israel.—**12.** *But you are profaning it*] *i. e.* treating the name of Yahweh, which is practically identical with Yahweh himself, as though it were not holy.—*When you say*] *i. e.* think in your hearts, or say by your actions.—*The table of the Lord is defiled and its food despicable*] *Cf.* v. [7] where the same language is employed in part.† The basis for the prophet's interpretation of their attitude toward Yahweh's sacrifices is furnished by vv. [8. 13] 2^{1-3}. It seems wholly unjustifiable to interpret this as a lament on the part of the priests to the effect that their work is heavy and their pay light,‡ the "food" being the portion of the sacrifice which fell to the priest. Had this been the thought, the priests would hardly have been represented as careless and indifferent regarding the quality of the sacrificial animals. It would have been a matter of personal interest to them that these should be sound and perfect.—**13.** *And when you say, Behold, what a weariness!*] The care of the ritual and the bringing of the offerings have become a burden to them. They no longer do it out of gratitude and devotion, but as a matter of hard necessity from which they would escape if they could. They have allowed it to become dull routine upon their hands,—a danger to which the ministers of highly ritualistic cults are always peculiarly liable.—*And you esteem me lightly*] Lit., "You snort (or sniff) at me." 𝔐 reads "at it"; but this is a scribal correction made for the purpose of removing an expression thought to reflect dishonour upon Yahweh (*v. i.*).—*Says Yahweh of hosts*] This is the ninth affirmation of the authority of Yahweh in support of the prophet's utterance; but the frequency of the phrase is not a sufficient

* *Cf.* 𝔄, Marti, Siev., Now.[K].

† Hence Marti eliminates [12b] as a gloss. But this needs stronger support than the need of the "poetic" structure.

‡ So *e. g.* Rosemn., Reinke.

ground for rejecting it.*—*And you bring the salvage and the lame and the sick*] Repeated from v. ^{8}, with a change in the first word. Some would correct this word to agree with v. ^{8}; but this is unnecessary. The "salvage" is literally, "that snatched away," *scil.* from the jaws of wild beasts;† hence mangled and unfit for sacrifice, or even for use as food; *cf.* Ex. 22^{31} Lv. 17^{15}.—*Yea, you bring it as an offering*] The verb is resumed after an exceptionally long object has intervened; it is, therefore, an error to omit it.‡ —*Can I accept it at your hand? says Yahweh of hosts*] 𝔐 omits "of hosts"; but it is the customary title in Malachi and it is read here by 𝔊 𝔖.§ The question carries its answer with it; they are acting unreasonably.—**14.** *But cursed be the cheat, in whose flock there is a male, yet he vows, and then sacrifices a damaged thing to the Lord*] This is a specific example of the conduct of those who despise the altar of Yahweh.** The nature of the offender's deceit is indicated by the act ascribed to him. Though having in his possession an animal that fully meets all the requirements for sacrifice, he nevertheless pays his sacrificial vows with a blemished and therefore less valuable animal, thus exhibiting stinginess and deceit toward Yahweh in one and the same act. Some interpreters would omit the phrase "yet he vows";†† but this leaves the charge weaker. There might be some excuse for such conduct on the part of the offender if his sacrifice were obligatory; but this is a case where he has himself voluntarily promised Yahweh a sacrifice and then grudges the fulfilment of his promise. Such an attitude is inexcusable.‡‡—*For a great king am I, says Yahweh of hosts*] If such conduct toward an earthly king be reprehensible and certain to arouse his anger, how much more so in the case of the king of kings! For the same line of reasoning, *cf.* v. ^{8}. For the conception of Yahweh as a king, which is exceedingly frequent in post-exilic writings in general and in the Psalms in particular, *cf.* 1 S. 12^{12} Je. 8^{19} 10^{10} Is. 33^{22} 43^{15} 44^{6}

* *Contra* Marti, Siev., *et al.*.

† So BDB., van H., *et al.*.

‡ *Contra* Now., Marti, *et al.*.

§ So also Marti, Siev., Bu., Isop..

** The connection with v. ^{13} is somewhat loose; hence Du. makes v. ^{14} a gloss.

†† So Siev., Now.^{K}.

‡‡ For a Babylonian judgment upon similar conduct, *cf.* the following citation from the *Shurpu* series of texts containing exorcisms: "Has he promised with heart and mouth but not kept it, by a (retained) gift despised the name of his god, consecrated something but held it back, presented something . . . but eaten it?" *V.* Jeremias, *The OT. in the Light of the Ancient East*, I, 226.

Zp. 3[15] Ps. 10[16] 24[7-10] 84[3] 95[3].—*And my name is held in awe among the nations*] This is a reiteration of the thought of v.[11]; but it forms a fitting close to the paragraph.

With 2[1], the thought changes again, being addressed specifically to the priests.—**2**[1]. *And now, unto you is this command, O priests*] The special command here referred to is not at once discoverable. There is no express "command" in the immediate context. On the other hand, the arraignment in the preceding verses charges that the accused have failed to honour Yahweh fittingly, which is their just and lawful service. Likewise, in the following verses stress is laid upon the necessity of glorifying Yahweh. Hence, the "command" is most easily explained as the behest to honour Yahweh, which lies behind the whole context. On account of the absence of any explicit "command" in the immediate context, other renderings have been offered, such as "admonition," "decision," "message," and "warning." But neither of these affords any appreciable advantage, since the context does not contain any one of them explicitly.—**2.** *If you do not hearken, and if you do not lay it to heart*] *Cf.* Is. 57[1] Dn. 1[8]. This repetition of the idea in different terms is after the manner of poetic parallelism and serves to emphasise the importance of the utterance.—*To give honour to my name, says Yahweh of hosts*] This is the main function of a priest; to fail here is to fail lamentably. The preceding verses have made it clear that the kind of honour meant is a due regard for the proper forms and other requirements regarding sacrifices and offerings.* —*Then I will send the curse among you*] *Cf.* 3[9] 4[6]. This is a kind

* For the Babylonian feeling concerning the necessity of honouring the gods, *cf.* the following citation from the *Shurpu* series of incantations, as translated by Jeremias, in *The OT. in the Light of the Ancient East*, I, 228:—

As though no libation had I brought to my god,
Or at mealtime my goddess had not been called upon,
My face not downcast, my footfall had not become visible;
(Like one) in whose mouth stayed prayer and supplication,
(With whom) the day of god ceased, the festival fell out;
Who was careless, who attended not to (the god's) decrees(?),
Fear and reverence (for god) taught not his people;
Who called not upon his god, ate of his food,
Forsook his goddess, a writing(?) brought her not;
He then, who was honoured, his lord forgot,
The name of his mighty god pronounced disparagingly—
Thus did I appear.

of thought that is very common in the Old Testament. Failure to conform to the requirements of Yahweh brings down his wrath upon the offender. Misfortune and suffering are in themselves evidences of that wrath. For representations of disaster as due to the curse of God, *cf.* Gn. $3^{14.17}$ 5^{29} 8^{21} Dt. 28^{20} 30^{7}.—*And I will turn your blessing into a curse*] Lit. "I will curse your blessing," *i. e.* send a curse upon and blast that which you count your blessing. In Ethiopic, "blessings" often means "goods" as in 3^{10} Is. 65^{8} Jo. 2^{14} Gn. $49^{25 f.}$ Ps. 21^{3} 84^{6} Pr. 28^{20}; *cf.* Lk. 12^{8}. This is better than to interpret the threat as applying to the priestly benedictions,* or specifically to the priestly revenues,† or in general to the priestly privileges.‡ For the reverse of this action on Yahweh's part, *v.* Dt. 23^{5} Ne. 13^{2}.—*Yea, indeed, I have cursed it, because you are not laying it to heart*] *Cf.* v. ^{2a}. The verb might also be rendered as a prophetic perfect, "I will curse it." But whether so taken, or taken as referring to the past, the whole sentence seems superfluous. As referring to the past it interrupts the connection between the preceding sentence and v. ^{3}, both of which look to the future. Furthermore, it blunts the edge of the threat, since it reveals the fact that instead of some new and awful calamity, which the preceding verses seem to announce, there will be nothing but a continuation of the present distress, which they have learned to endure. Not only so, but it also seems to take for granted the failure of the priests to respond to Yahweh's demands, notwithstanding his threats. In connection with this interpretation, it is possible to give the latter part of the sentence the rendering "though you are not laying it to heart." That is, the curse has already fallen, but you have failed to realise the significance of the afflictions that have befallen you. As referring to the future, it unnecessarily repeats the substance of the preceding protasis and apodosis. It is, therefore, probably due to marginal annotation.§—**3.** *Behold, I am going to hew off the arm for you*] *Cf.* 1 S. 2^{31}. 𝔊 reads, "rebuke the seed for you." But this would be primarily a punishment upon the farmers, and only through them would

* So Ew., Ke., Schegg, Knabenbauer, Or..
† Hi..
‡ Now., van H..
§ So Marti, Now.^{K}, Siev., Kent.

the priests suffer.* The reference to "faces" immediately following makes the reading "arm" more probable. Besides this, it has the support of the versions. The figure is a bold one and is used to express forcefully the idea that the priestly arm heretofore stretched out in blessing upon the people will lose its power and fail to bring the desired results.†—*And I will strew dung upon your faces*] Thus rendering the priests unclean and wholly unfit for the discharge of the priestly function; *cf.* Ez. 4^{12-15}. —*The dung of your feasts*] This is probably an interpreter's gloss.‡ The festal sacrifices in honour of Yahweh will be made by him the means of discrediting and disgracing the faithless priesthood. —*And I will carry you away from beside me*] 𝕸 reads, "And he will carry you away unto it."§ But the change of person is too abrupt and the "it" is too indefinite. Hence the reading of 𝕾, with the first person, must be considered as the original. As corrected, the text threatens the priests with removal from the presence of Yahweh, *i. e.* exile from the holy city and the temple with which their whole life is bound up.—**4.** *And you will know that I sent forth this law unto you*] Their knowledge will come through their realisation that the fact of their exile means that Yahweh's anger has been aroused against them on account of their laxness and indifference regarding the cultus for which they are held responsible. The "law" referred to is evidently the same as in v. [1].—*Seeing that my covenant was with Levi, says Yahweh of hosts*] This indicates the reason for Yahweh's having laid this responsibility upon the priesthood. The language used also permits a translation of the clause as expressive of purpose, viz. "in order that my covenant might be with Levi."** But it is difficult to discover any meaning for such a purpose-clause in this context. The common method of explanation on this basis is to say that the prophet refers to the decree of punishment which has gone forth from Yahweh and is to take the place

* Yet Or. interprets "seed" of posterity; the priests are thus threatened with childlessness.

† So Ew., Reinke, *et al.*. Others interpret "arm" of the shoulder of the sacrificial victim, which portion belonged to the priest; so Reuss, Isop., Nestle (*ZAW*. XXIX, 154 *f.*).

‡ So We., Now., Wkl., Marti, Siev..

§ *Cf.* Am. 4^3, from which Marti would derive this as a gloss (so Siev., Now.[K], Kent) Now. *et al.* abandon the attempt to interpret this phrase.

** So *e. g.* 𝕾, Jer., Hi., Mau., van H..

of the old covenant.* But a decree is not a covenant, nor is there any reason to suppose, in the nature of the language used, that v.^{4} refers to a different time from that alluded to in v.^{5}, which is evidently not in the future, but in the past. The character of the covenant with Levi to which reference is made is indicated in v.^{5}. "Levi" is here best accounted for as representative of the priestly class, rather than as the name of the son of Jacob. Thus it appears that the writer thinks of the priests as "sons of Levi" (*cf.* 3^{3}) in accordance with the standard of Deuteronomy, rather than as "sons of Zadok" (Ez. 44^{15}), or as "sons of Aaron," the designation of P (Lv. 8, 21^{1}). This points to the origin of Malachi as lying in the period before the adoption of the Priestly Code.—**5.** *My covenant was with him*] A reaffirmation for the sake of emphasis. As usually rendered, these words are connected directly with the two following in some way; *e. g.* "my covenant was with him (regarding) life and peace," or "my covenant was with him (a covenant of) life and peace." But the syntax of such renderings is very difficult and the accentuation of 𝔐 is against them.—*Life and welfare—I gave them to him*] Yahweh fulfilled his side of the covenant. The word "welfare" represents a complex of ideas, viz. peace, quiet, protection, and health. Yahweh's gift included life and all that makes life worth living. The thought and phraseology of this verse thus far at once recall Nu. $25^{12.\ 13}$ (=P), where the covenant of Yahweh is said to have been established with Phinehaz, the son of Aaron. But that is a more specialised and advanced form of the tradition than this which extends the blessings of the covenant in question to the whole family of Levi.—*Fear, and he feared me*] "Fear" is co-ordinate with "life and welfare," all three being in reality objects of "gave." "Fear" here is evidently not terror, but rather reverence and awe such as kept the priesthood in faithful obedience to the will of God as expressed in the ritual and the Tôrah.—*And before my name he was overwhelmed with awe*] The phrase "my name" is practically equivalent to "me"; *cf.* $1^{6.\ 11.\ 14}$ 2^{1}. The contrast between the priesthood that was and that which now is is being brought out sharply

* So *e. g.* Luther, Cal., Umbreit, Ke., Köh., Pres..

by the prophet. It is doubtful whether he is referring to any especial period of the past. It is probably but another case of indiscriminate glorification of the past as compared with the present. The prophet recalls with melancholy regret "the good old times."—**6.** *True instruction was in his mouth and perversity was not found upon his lips*] *i. e.* he was proof against bribery and corruption; *cf.* Dt. 33^{8-11}. He gave the oracle of Yahweh as he received it, giving justice to the oppressed and meting out penalties to the oppressor. But now the judgments of the priestly courts are bought and sold; *cf.* Mi. 3^{11}. The rendering "law of truth" fails to represent aright the Hebrew idiom (*v. i.*). The word "instruction" here refers neither to the Mosaic law nor to any such abstract and indefinite thing as the principle of truth. It is rather the specific decision of the priest, given in cases that were appealed through him to Yahweh, the final arbiter; *cf.* Dt. $17^{8ff.}$ 19^{17}.—*In peace and uprightness, he walked with me*] To "walk with God" is to worship God. It implies living in full accord with the divine will and denotes a more intimate fellowship with God than that expressed by the more common phrase "walk after"; *cf.* Dt. 8^{19} 13^{4} Je. 7^{9} 2 K. 23^{3} Ho. 11^{10}. It is used of Enoch (Gn. $5^{22.24}$) and Noah (Gn. 6^{9}), and of no others. The term "peace" indicates the tranquillity and harmony existing between God and his obedient and loyal priesthood. The "uprightness" meant is the reverse of the "perversity" just mentioned; it is an unswerving moral integrity.—*And many did he turn from iniquity*] *Cf.* Dn. 12^{3}, where great reward is promised those who "turn many to righteousness." In this statement, the priesthood is conceived of as much more than a body of men set for the exact performance of the ritual, or as men through whom the will of God is made known as messages are transmitted through a telephone. It is rather an agency endowed with great possibilities as a positive force for instruction and reproof in righteousness.—**7.** *For the lips of a priest should treasure knowledge*] Having stated the nature of the priestly service once rendered by the former priesthood, the writer before taking up directly the contrast afforded by the priesthood of his own times stops for a moment to say that what

had once been done was but the proper function of a priest. There was nothing abnormal or extraordinary in the performance; the priesthood had but done its duty. "Knowledge" is nowhere else mentioned in Malachi. Evidently it connotes something more than mere learning, or the possession of a mass of facts, however great. It is here practically identical with that wisdom the beginning of which is the "fear of the Lord." It is used in a similar sense in Ho. $4^{1.\ 6}$ 6^{6}. On the basis of the occurrence of this word, G. A. Smith entitles the whole section "the priesthood of knowledge," and writes forceful words concerning the necessity of an intellectual type of ministers. True as all this is, it is hardly the thought of this prophet. Intellectualism and search for truth in the abstract were outside the pale of his interest. His concern was wholly within the field of practical religion and morality.—*And instruction should they seek at his mouth*] The word "instruction" includes the oracle of Yahweh as in v. ^{6}, and also the teaching as to the correct discharge of ritualistic obligations.—*For the messenger of Yahweh of hosts is he*] As the spokesman of Yahweh, people have a right to expect truth and justice from the priest. Unfaithfulness to such a responsibility is a most heinous offence. This is the only case in which this title is applied to the priest. In earlier writings it designates the angel sent by Yahweh to communicate his will to men; *e. g.* Gn. $16^{7\ ff.}$ Nu. $22^{22\ ff.}$ Ju. 5^{23} $13^{13\ ff.}$. Apparently, the claim is that Yahweh who once spoke to his people through a specially appointed angel now has chosen the priesthood to perform that function. This is a conception of the importance and dignity of the priesthood that is unsurpassed, if it be even equalled, elsewhere in the Old Testament. It renders the work of the prophet superfluous. The priestly Tôrah leaves no room or need even for angelic teachers. *Cf.* Hg. 1^{13}, where the title "angel of Yahweh" is applied to a prophet, viz. Haggai himself. The writer now proceeds to show how far the priesthood has fallen from this high ideal.—**8.** *But you have turned aside from the way*] *i. e.* the way of Yahweh; *cf.* Ex. 32^{8} Dt. $9^{12.\ 16}$ 11^{28} 31^{29} Ju. 2^{17} 1 S. $12^{20\ f.}$.—*You have caused many to stumble on account of the instruction*] The priests have perverted the oracle of Yahweh

and so caused offence to those who have been thus wronged. The priestly Tôrah which should guide men in the way of Yahweh has been so used as to turn them away from Yahweh. If the priest of God be unfaithful, it is inevitable that the common people lose faith not only in the priest, but also in his God.—*You have violated the covenant of Levi, says Yahweh of hosts*] *Cf.* vv.$^{4.5}$. The priests have failed to fulfil their part of the covenant; they have broken their promise; they have been false to their vows.—**9.** *And so I have made you despised and low before all the people*] This is Yahweh's punishment of the priesthood for its faithlessness. The versions read "peoples"; but this involves making the prophet address the nation and refer to the fallen fortunes of Judah. The entire context requires that the address be to the priesthood and the reference to the loss of prestige with the people which it has already suffered.—*Inasmuch as you are not keeping my ways, but are showing partiality through the oracle*] Yahweh is a righteous God, dispensing justice without fear or favour; *cf.* 2 Ch. 19^7. The priests, in that they allow their decisions to be influenced by considerations of place and power, or even by gifts and bribes, are not walking in Yahweh's ways; *cf.* Ho. 14^9 Ps. 145^{17}. Besides this, the connivance of the priests with the kind of deceit exposed in $1^{8.14}$ is doubtless included in the charge here.

The integrity of 1^6–2^9 has been seriously called in question at only one point. Böh., followed by Marti, Siev. and Now.^{K}, would omit 2^7 as an interpolation. The grounds alleged in support of this contention are (1) that v.^{7} dulls the sharp contrast between v.^{6} and v.^{8} by separating them; (2) that it is superfluous after v.^{6}; (3) that Yahweh is here spoken of, whereas in vv.$^{6.8}$ he is himself the speaker; and (4) that the conception of the מלאך י׳ is different here from that represented elsewhere in the book, *e. g.* 3^1. But v.^{7} is in close connection with the thought of v.^{6} and the contrast between v.^{7} and v.^{8} suffers relatively little by comparison with that between v.^{6} and v.^{8}. Moreover, there is a direct connection between v.^{7} and v.^{8}, the latter pointing out that the priests do just the opposite of that which has been stated as their duty in the former. It is no uncommon thing for a prophet to intermingle statements in the third person with those in the first person, when he is speaking in the name of Yahweh; *v.* $1^{6.14}$ $3^{2.4.22}$. It is quite true that the representation of the priesthood as itself the מלאך י׳ is

not found elsewhere in Mal.; but neither is it found anywhere else in the OT.. It is a conception of the priesthood which is, to say the least, as easily explicable upon the lips of the author of Mal. as it would be coming from any other source. His high regard for the priesthood as an invaluable institution is sufficiently well attested by the indignation that stirs him as he contemplates the indifference and disloyalty of the priesthood of his own day. Hence, the case against 2^{7} seems too weak to carry conviction.

1^{6}. יכבד] Impf. expressing customary action; not a jussive = "should honour" (*contra* Kö., *et al.*).—אב] Rd. אביו, with 𝔖 𝔄 ℭ$^{Bo.}$ Eth.; so Bu., Hal., Now.^{K}.—ועבד] Add ייראו, with 𝔊$^{N\ c.\ a}$ HP. 22, 36, 51, 62, 68, 86 mg., 𝔗, Eth., Arm.; so Jer., Oort, Smend, We., Now., Marti, Siev., Bu., Dr., Or., van H., Hal., Du.$^{Pro.}$.—אדניו] *Cf.* foll. אדנים; pl. of majesty; *cf.* Ges. § 124 i; *cf.* also Gn. 39^{2} 42^{30} Dt. 10^{17} 2 S. 11^{9} Is. 19^{4} Ho. 12^{15} Ps. 136^{3}.—אני] Pausal form; Ges. § 32 c.—לכם] 𝔊 ὑμεῖς, in apposition with foll. "priests."—ואמרתם] Does not continue בוזי שמי, in the sense "you who despise my name and say"; but introduces the priests' question, "yet ye say," etc..—7. מגישים] *Cf.* Ges. § 116 s, on omission of subject. Equivalent to an explanatory clause with אשר = "in that ye," etc..—מגאל] גאל = געל in the later writings, *e. g.* Is. 59^{3} Ezr. 2^{62}.—ואמרתם] 𝔊$^{B\ mg.}$ καὶ εἴπατε, originally under obelus.—גאלנוך] Rd. גְאַלְנוּהוּ, with 𝔊 ἠλισγήσαμεν αὐτούς and 𝔗; so Gr., Torrey, Marti, van H., Now.^{K}, Du.$^{Pro.}$, Kent.—נבזה] 𝔊^{BA} ἠλισγημένη. 𝔊$^{NQY\ Heid.}$ ἐξουδενωμένη; so HP. 22, 36, 42, 49, 51, 95, 130, 185, 198, 233, 238, 240, 311 and 𝔖^{H} ℭ$^{Ba.}$ Arm.. 𝔏 *benedicta*.—הוא] 𝔊^{BY} adds, καὶ τὰ ἐπιτιθέμενα ἐξουδενώσατε; so 𝔏, Arm.. 𝔊$^{N\ c.\ b}$ βρώματα ἐξουδένωνται. 𝔊$^{AQ\ Heid.}$, HP. 26, 36, 40, 49, 79, 86 mg., 106, 198, 233 and ℭ$^{Bo.}$, βρώματα ἐξουδενώμενα. 𝔖^{H} marks the addition with an obelus. Jer. explains it as borrowed from 1^{12}.—8. עור, פסח וחלה] Anarthrous, because wholly indefinite, viz. "*any* blind," etc..—לפחתך] This official probably was a Jew, though it is by no means certain. The only persons by whom we know the title "governor of Judah" to have been borne are Zerubbabel (Hg. $1^{1.14}$ $2^{2.21}$), Nehemiah (Ne. $5^{14\,f.\,18}$ 12^{26}), and Bagoas (Sachau's Elephantine Papyri, I, 1; *cf.* I, 29). That Nehemiah had had several predecessors is made certain by Ne. $5^{14\,f.}$. He himself seems to have held a somewhat exceptional position, being designated as "governor *in* Judah" and having been appointed for a definite period (Ne. 2^{7}). It would seem that at his time Judah was normally under the jurisdiction of the governor of Samaria, which so far as Judah was concerned was set aside in favour of Nehemiah while the latter was in Jerusalem. In the time of Bagoas (411–407 B.C.), Judah and Samaria were small districts, each under its own פ׳, who was probably under the jurisdiction of the ruler of the great trans-Euphrates province (*cf.* Ezr. 5^{3} 8^{36} Ne. $2^{7.9}$ 3^{7}).—הירצך] Rd. הֲיִרְצֵהוּ, with 𝔊$^{N\ c.\ a\ AQ}$, HP. 86, 233, 𝔄, ℭ$^{Bo.}$, and 𝔙; so We., Now.,

Marti, Dr., Bu., Siev., van H., Isop., Du.Pro. 𝔊Y om. sf..—9. אל] 𝔊 τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν.—ויחננו] 𝔊A καὶ δεήθητε αὐτοῦ; to which 𝔊N c.a Y adds ἵνα ἐλεήσῃ ὑμᾶς (so also HP. 22, 36, 51, 𝔈Bo., 𝔙). Bu. וִיחָנְנוּ, and tr. to foll. פניס. Hal. הַיְחָנְכֶם. Siev. וּבְחָנוּהוּ. Isop. וְהִתְחַנְּנוּ.—מידכם] Bu. כִּי מ׳.—הישא] 𝔊AY = האשא; so 𝔄, Eth., 𝔈Bo., Arm.. But 𝔊N* λήμψονται (𝔊N c.a. c.b = ομαι).—מכם] Treated by Hi. *et al.* as a partitive מִן = "from among you"; by Ke., Köh. *et al.* as causal = "on your account"; while Hd., We., Now., *et al.* regard מכם פנים as a slightly stronger expression than פניכם, viz. "will he accept faces of any of you?" This latter view seems the best.—פנים] 𝔊 𝔙 = פניכם.—10. מי] 𝔊 = כי, confusing מ and כ; *v.* note on Mi. 1² in *ICC*.. For other cases of a מי clause expressing an optative idea, even with מי separated from its impf. by intervening words, *v.* Is. 42²³ Ps. 107⁴³ Je. 9¹¹ Ho. 14¹⁰ Ps. 89⁴⁹ Jb. 13¹⁹ 41²; *cf.* Ges.§ 151 a.—בכם] 𝔊 = *against you*, connecting it with יסגר.—ויסגר] 𝔊 συνκλεισθήσονται.—דלתים] Dual, for the two leaves of the door. On form, *v.* Ges.§ 88 a.—ולא] 𝔙 om. לא.—תאירו] 𝔙 *incendat*. 𝔊BNA, HP. 62, 86, 147, ἀνάψεται; but 𝔊Held. 𝔖H 𝔄 𝔈Bo., Arm., HP. 22, 26, 36, 40, 42, 49, 51, 68, 95, 106, 130, 185, 228, 233, 238, 310, 311, ἀνάψατε.—צבאות] 𝔗 om.; so Now.K, Siev..—11. גדול] 𝔊 δεδόξασται.—מקום] GASm. interprets as = "sanctuary"; *cf.* Zp. 2¹¹ and Ar. *makâm*. But the context here seems to militate somewhat against so restricted a sense.—מקטר] 𝔙 *sacrificatur*. 𝔊 θυμίαμα. Lagrange (*RB.* '06, p. 80), מְקֻטָּר; so Siev.(?), van H., Hal., Bu.(?). Now. מְקֻטָּר. DuPro. reads this and the foll. word as קְטֹרֶת תֻּגַּשׁ. It is better taken as a prtc. Hophal = "smoke is made to arise," than as a ἅπ. noun; *cf.* Ges.§ 121 b.—מגש] Om. as a gloss on the rare form מקטר; so We., Now., Marti. 𝔊 προσάγεται. 𝔊A προσαγάγετε. 𝔖 𝔙, with 11 mss. of Kenn., ומגש; so DHM., Isop..—ומנחה טהורה] Eth. adds "to my holy name." 𝔄 om.; so DHM.. We. om. ו with 𝔖, 13 mss. of Kenn. and 2 of de R.; so Now., Isop..—צבאות] 𝔗 om., but adds *et sacrificium acceptum non habebo ex manibus vestris.* —12. אדני] Marti, יְהוָה.—מגאל] Torrey questions the right of מ׳ to a place in this verse and suspects considerable confusion between vv. ⁷ and ¹². Du.Pro. מְנֹאָץ.—הוא] Siev. om..—וניבו נבזה] Rd. וְנִבְזֶה, omitting ניבו as dittog., with 𝔖 and apparently 𝔗; so WRS. (OTJC. 444), We., GASm., Now., Marti, Oort, Siev., Isop., Kent. 𝔊 καὶ τὰ ἐπιτιθέμενα ἐξουδένωνται (𝔊N c.a = ενωται). 𝔙 *et quod superponitur contemptibile est.* Hal. וְעָמְוֹ נבזה. Bu. וּמִזְבְּחָה נבזה. Du.Pro. וניב נבזה. ניב occurs only here and in Is. 57¹⁹, where Kt. reads נוב and the text is by no means certain. The meaning required there is "fruit" (*scil.* of the lips) and that is in keeping with the meaning of the vb. נוב, "to grow." But any such meaning is inappropriate here, since the gifts laid upon the table of י׳ can hardly be spoken of as the fruit or product of that table. Hence the probability of the origin of the word here through error.—אכלו] 𝔙 *cum igne qui illud devorat*, a free rendering of the form pointed as a prtc., viz. אֹכְלוֹ. Van H. om. as a gloss on ניבו.—13. ואמרתם] Pf. with

waw consecutive continuing the inf. cstr. באמרכם.—מַתְּלָאָה] = מַה־תּ׳; *cf.* לְמַבָּר׳, 1 Ch. 15[13]; מַזֶּה, Ex. 4[2]; מַלָּכֶם, Is. 3[15]; לְמַדַּי, 2 Ch. 30[3]; מַדּוּעַ; and מָהֵם, Ez. 8[6]. *Cf.* Ges. § 20 c. 37 c. 𝔊 *ἐκ κακοπαθίας ἐστίν* = מִתְּלָאָה; so 𝔖 𝔙 𝔗. We. objects to מַתְּל׳ on the ground that הִנֵּה (𝔊 𝔖 = הִנֵּה) cannot precede מָה, which must hold first place in the sentence; but *cf.* הִנֵּה מה טוב, Ps. 133[1]. Hal. הוּא חֶלְאָה; *cf.* Ez. 24[6. 11. 12].—והפחתם אותו] Rd. וה׳ אֹתִי, with 𝔖 𝔗[Bo.] 𝔄, Arm., Eth.; so also Jer., Ra., Rosenm., Gr., Ginsburg, Now., Marti, Siev., Isop.. It is תִּקּוּן סוֹפְרִים. 𝔊 *καὶ ἐξεφύσησα αὐτά* = והפחתי אותם. 𝔊[ℵ] *ἐξεφυσήσατε*. Bu. כְּחַנְתְּכֶם א׳. The Hiph. of נפח occurs only here and in Jb. 31[39]. In the Qal, it means "to blow into" (or "upon"). Here it evidently denotes some act expressive of contempt and scorn, and in Jb. 31[39] something equivalent to "oppress" or "crush," with נפש as object. It is hardly possible to interpret the Hiph. here and the Qal in Hg. 1[9] in precisely the same way. Nor is anything gained by Now.'s proposal to connect it with √ פוח, in which case the form would be somewhat irregular.—גזול] Rd. with van H. and Isop., אֶת־הַגּ׳. These three additional letters are called for by the fact that the two co-ordinate words have them. Their disappearance was caused by their close similarity to the last letters of the preceding word. We., on the basis of v. [8], corrects to אֶת־הָעִוֵּר; so also Now., Marti, Siev., Hal., Bu., Kent. Chajes, in *Giornale d. Societa Asiatica Ital.*, XIX, 178, suggests גּוֹזָל = "the young of birds" (Dt. 32[11]). Gr. and Du.[Pro.], מגאל. The usual word for a thing torn by beasts is טְרֵפָה (Ex. 22[30] Lv. 17[15]). ג׳ has therefore been interpreted by some (*e. g.* Rosenm.) of things stolen from their rightful owner. But the two words co-ordinate with it militate against any such sense here, as does also the corresponding series in v. [8]. Van H. cites in support of the meaning here adopted the analogy of the Ar. *gazila* = "was injured" and *'agzal* = *injured* (one), used in speaking of an animal. But these terms are applied specifically to a camel whose withers have been galled by the saddle; hence they furnish little support for the meaning "torn by wild beasts" or "snatched away from wild beasts." The context is the strongest argument in its behalf.—והבאתם את המנחה] Rd. וה׳ אתה מנחה, with We.; so DHM., Bu., Isop., van H., Hal.. Siev. and Kent om. the whole phrase. Now. om. והבאתם את ה׳, as due to dittog.; while Marti explains it as a misplaced marginal correction of the first והבאתם, intended to show that אֶת ה׳ should be inserted after it.—**14.** נוכל] 𝔊 *ὃς ἦν δυνατός*. 𝔙 *dolosus*. Elsewhere found only in Gn. 37[18] Nu. 25[18] Ps. 105[25]; but these passages with the Assy. and Aram. usage of the same root, make certain the general meaning "cunning," "skilful," "deceitful."—ויש] Bu. om. ו.—ונדר] 𝔊 *καὶ εὐχὴ αὐτοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ*; hence GASm., וְנִדְרוֹ (so Bu., Isop.(?)); but 𝔊 may easily be a rendering according to sense. Now.[K] suggests the omission of this word. But it is easily accounted for as a part of the original text. The words ויש ונו׳ define נוכל and are themselves in the nature of a conditional clause, of

which ונרר . . . ויש constitutes the protasis, and וזבח the apodosis.—מָשְׁחָת] Pointed thus as masc. (*cf.* Lv. 22^{25}) by Baer, Ginsburg, and Kittel. Many earlier scholars (*e.g.* Hi., Mau.) pointed as a fem., viz. מָשְׁחַת = מָשְׁחָתָה, and found here a contrast with זכר, "a male." But the fem. form does not occur; nor were female animals excluded from sacrifice in general, though they were not acceptable for certain specific offerings; *cf.* Ex. 12^{5} Lv. 1^{3} 3^{1} 4^{23} 5^{6} $16^{5.6}$.—לאדני] Many mss. ליהוה; so Hd., Marti, Siev..—אמר יהוה צ'] Omitted as later addition by Marti, Now.^K^, Siev..—נורא] 𝔊 ἐπιφανής. 𝔙 *horribile*.—2^{2}. לתת כבוד לשמי] Siev. tr. to follow הכהנים in v. ^{1}; but it is hardly suitable as a definition of המצוה, and fits much better where it is in 𝔐.—ברכותיכם] Rd. בִּרְכַּתְכֶם, with 𝔊 and in agreement with the foll. sf. in sg.; so Marti, Now.^K^, Bu., van H., Isop., Du.^Pro.^.—וגם ארותיה] 𝔖 om.; so Eth., 𝔄. We. suggests וגם אָרוֹר; so Now.. 𝔊^BAY^ ℭ^Bo.^ 𝔄, Eth., Arm. add καὶ διασκεδάσω τὴν εὐλογίαν ὑμῶν καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν. 𝔖^H^ puts this addition before וגם וגו' and obelises καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν. 𝔊^B^ obelises the entire addition and notes in the margin its absence from the Heb.. It seems to be a clear case of verbose expansion in 𝔊.—3. גער] Rd. גֹּדֵעַ, with We.; so Now., Oort, Marti, Dr., Bu., Siev., van H., Du.^Pro.^, Kent. *Cf.* 𝔊 ἀφορίζω = גרע. 𝔙 *projiciam*. Aq., Σ. ἐπιτιμῶ. Wkl. גֹּדֵעַ; so Isop.. גער is usually followed by בְּ; but lacks it here and in Ps. 9^{6} 68^{31} 119^{21}. The meaning it yields is not satisfactory in this context; *v. s.*. Nor is any material advantage gained by changing to גרע.—לכם] *Dat. incommodi*.—הזרע] Rd. הַזְּרֹעַ, with 𝔊 τὸν ὦμον, 𝔙 *brachium*, and Aq.; so Houb., Mich., Eichhorn, New., Ew., Schegg, Reinke, Köh., Ke., We., Now., Oort, Marti, Dr., Bu., Siev., van H., Isop., Du.^Pro.^, Kent, *et al.*. *Cf.* 1 S. 2^{31}, for the same figure. Hi. הַזֹּרֵעַ. Wkl. הַשַּׂעַר.—פרש] 𝔙 om.. 𝔊 ἔνυστρον = "stomach." Aq., Σ Θ κόπρον. Wkl. פרע = "long hair"; *cf.* Lv. 10^{6} 21^{10}. פֶּרֶשׁ occurs also in Ex. 29^{14} Lv. 4^{11} 8^{17} 16^{27} Nu. 19^{5}. In these passages, it is always listed as a part of the sacrificial animal which must be burned outside of the camp, along with the "skin and flesh," or "skin, flesh and blood," or "skin, flesh, thigh-bones, and inwards." It seems to have been the fæcal matter in the intestines, or possibly the intestines themselves. Isop., adopting the latter meaning, interprets the passage as a threat to withdraw the shoulder, which has hitherto been the priest's due, and to give in exchange that portion of the animal which, being unclean, might not be eaten and was, therefore, of no value. *Cf.* Nestle (*ZAW*. XXIX, 154 *f.*), who calls attention to the fact that קֵבָה, "stomach," in Dt. 18^{3} is rendered by 𝔊 𝔖 with exactly the same words as are used for פרש here, and so interprets this as a threat to deprive the priests of the sacrificial shoulder and stomach which were assigned to them by the Deuteronomic law (18^{3}). But the language employed does not convey any suggestion of an exchange, nor is the idea of withdrawal very clear in the expression "spread upon your faces." Then, too, if the shoulder and stomach

were withdrawn, why should the "two cheeks" (Dt. 18³) not have gone with them?—עַל פניכם פ'] 𝔊ᴺ om.; v. s..—חגיכם] 𝔖 prefixes עַל. Bu. ונשא אתכם אליו—.זבחיכם רעים] Rd. וְנָשָׂאתִיכֶם מֵעָלַי; *cf.* 𝔖 *I will take you away with it.* 𝔊 *καὶ λήμψομαι ὑμᾶς εἰς τὸ αὐτό.* 𝔙 *et assumet vos secum.* The error of 𝔐 is due to wrong distribution of letters, dittog., haplography, and confusion between א and ע which is common. For the usage of מֵעַל here involved, *cf.* Je. 2⁵ 32⁴⁰ Ho. 9¹. Bu. ונשאתיכם מֵאִתִּי, coming through מאלי. Now. ונשאתיכם אליו(?); so Oort. Du.ᴾʳᵒ· ומשאתיכם. Hal. proposes אָלָה, "curse" for אליו.—**4.** שלחתי] 𝔊ʸ ᴴᵉˡᵈ· add *κύριος*, in apposition with the subject.—להיות] Bu. מִהְיוֹת; and Du.ᴾʳᵒ· עַל ה'; but such changes seem superfluous, since לְ = "in view of the fact that" occurs in Ex. 12⁴² Nu. 11¹¹ 1 S. 12⁷ 14³³. Siev. לִהְיוֹת; so Now.ᴷ (*cf.* Hb. 3²).—**5.** אתו] 𝔗 om. sf..—החיים והשלום] 𝔊 *τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τῆς εἰρήνης*; so 𝔙 𝔗. The two nouns are most easily handled as prefixed objects, which are taken up again in the foll. sf. ם ̣—.ואתנם] 𝔊 𝔙 om. sf.; so also mss. 129 (Kenn.) and 226 (de R.). Hence, Ew. and Reinke, וָאֶתְּנָה.—מורא] The third object of ואת'. It might possibly be construed as taking the place of an inf. absolute, with intensive force. 𝔊 *ἐν φόβῳ*. 𝔊ᴺʸ om. *ἐν*. Oort prefixes לְ. Bu. and Now.ᴷ, מוֹרָאִי. Isop. הַמּוֹרָא(?). Du.ᴾʳᵒ· ומוֹרָא. Siev. prefixes וְנָתַתִּי.—וייראני] 𝔊 *φοβεῖσθαι*; but 𝔊ᴮᵃᵇ ⁽ᵛⁱᵈ⁾ ᴺᴬᵠʸ add *με*. Bu. וְיִירָאנִי; so Now.ᴷ, Du.ᴾʳᵒ·; but the context requires that this verb state a fact of history, rather than a purpose or a hope. Furthermore, Bu.'s change here involves a change also in the following verb.—נחת] 𝔊 *στέλλεσθαι*, with הוא as object. 𝔗 *proficisci.* 𝔙 *pavebat*; so 𝔖 𝔗. Bu. and Now.ᴷ יֵחַת, or יִנָּחֵת. נ' is a form in Niph. pf. from חתת and must not be confused with the root נחת.—**6.** אמת] A genitive after a cstr., with the force of an adjective; Ges. § 128 p.—עַוְלָה] Usually treated as fem.; but here and in Ez. 28¹⁵, if text be correct, taken as masc.. Albrecht (*ZAW.* XVI, 117) proposes to obviate the difficulty by reading וְעָוֹן, since 𝔊 uses *ἀδικία* for both עולה and עון here. But there are too many cases of similar irregularity for suspicion of the text to be justifiable here; *cf.* Kö. II² § 245 d for a list of them.—בשלום] 𝔗 *in pace linguae.*—ובמישור] 𝔊 *κατευθύνων*.—**7.** ישמרו] A potential impf. expressing obligation; Ges. § 107 r.—**8.** שמתם] Now.ᴷ suggests וְשׂ', or that some word has been omitted from before שׂ'. But this is a gratuitous suggestion, since the asyndetic structure is established by the foregoing הכשלתם.—**9.** לכל העם] 𝔊 𝔙 𝔗 pl.; so 12 mss. of Kenn. and 14 of de R.. לְ here denotes the agent, after the pass. נבזים, a construction to which the adjective שפ' adjusts itself easily.—פנים] Torrey פָּנַי; so Marti, Dr.(?), Siev., Now.ᴷ, Kent. This yields the sense, "nor respecting me" (*scil.* Yahweh). But נ' פנים is always used of the act or attitude of one in authority toward an inferior or suppliant. It is never = "bestow honour upon" (a superior) as this reading would require.

§ 4. YAHWEH'S PROTEST AGAINST DIVORCE AND REMARRIAGE WITH IDOLATROUS WOMEN (2^{10-16}).

This has been rightly called the most difficult section of the Book of Malachi. Its difficulties do not, however, obscure the general course of the thought. The prophet brings to light another obstacle in the way of the full manifestation of Yahweh's love for Judah. He reminds the people of their common origin, and charges them with disloyalty to one another and to Yahweh in the fact that they have divorced their faithful Jewish wives and contracted new marriages with foreign women. In view of this sin, they need not wonder that Yahweh refuses to hear their prayers. He desires the propagation of a pure and godly race. Therefore his people must be loyal to their marriage relationships; for divorce is a deadly evil.

10. *Have we not all one father?*] The address now is to the people, rather than the priests. They are reminded of their common fellowship, as members of the same spiritual family. "Father" here refers to Yahweh (*cf.* 1^{6}), and the question is parallel to the following one in meaning as well as in form. Some interpreters have seen here an allusion to the human progenitors of the Hebrews, viz. Abraham,* or Jacob,† or even Adam.‡ But human parentage would scarcely be assigned the place of honour, coming first in the sentence, with Yahweh taking second place.—*Has not one God created us?*] This, of course, is a proposition that would apply equally well to all mankind in the mind of this writer and the more thoughtful of his contemporaries. But in this and the preceding question, he is evidently thinking of the spiritual unity that should prevail in his nation, because of the especially close relationship between them and the great God of the world. He is laying a basis for his protest against the introduction of schismatic elements into the community's life.—*Why do we deceive each his brother*] Certain conduct is characterised here as treachery among brethren and wholly in-

* So *e. g.* Jer., Sanctius, Theiner, Knabenbauer, Hal..
† So *e. g.* AE., Ki., Grotius, Pococke.
‡ So Abar., *et al.*.

consistent with the fact of their common family unity.—*In profaning the covenant of our fathers?*] It is not likely that any specific covenant is intended. It is rather figuratively used, denoting the general obligation of loyalty one to another that has been inherited from the past. For a similar use of the word "covenant," *v.* Am. 1[9].* A covenant was regularly confirmed by an oath and thus given religious sanction; hence its violation is properly characterised as profanation; *cf.* Ps. 55[21] 89[32. 35]. There is no reason for segregating this verse from vv.[11. 12] on the ground that it is an introduction to a discussion of the evils of divorce, while the following verses are concerned with mixed marriages.† The practice of mixed marriage was fraught with such serious consequences for the religious and social unity of the community that those of the stricter sort felt perfectly justified in branding those who contracted such unions as disloyal to their brethren. This accounts too for the use of the term "brother"; whereas, if v.[10] had only divorce in view, we should have expected some word designating the wronged women.—**11.** *Judah has played traitor and abomination has been wrought in Jerusalem*] 𝕸 reads "in Israel and in Jerusalem." But this is due to expansion by a later editor.‡ Israel, as distinguished from Judah, is not elsewhere in Malachi the occasion of protest or promise and lies outside of the circle of interest; while, if it be identical with Judah here, it has been rendered unnecessary by the immediately preceding mention of Judah. The conduct of individuals, or of a group, within Judah has involved the whole community in reproach. As the ensuing sentence shows, the prophet here turns to the aspect of the people's sin which directly concerns Yahweh himself. The term "abomination" is prevailingly used of things or acts that are abhorrent to Yahweh, *e. g.* idolatry, uncleanness, irregularities of ritual, and violations of ethical law.—*For Judah has profaned the sanctuary of Yahweh which he loved*] The prophet's attitude toward the temple is of a piece with his denunciation of the criminal carelessness of the priests in 1[6 ff.]. The

* For the wide range of meaning acquired by ברית, *cf.* art. "Covenant," by N. Schmidt, in *EB*..

† *Contra* GASm., *et al.*.

‡ So Pres., We., Now., Marti, Bu., Dr., Isop., Du.[Pro].

temple and all the rites connected therewith were dear to him. This is the only place where Yahweh is explicitly said to love the temple; but it is implied in his love for Mt. Zion (Ps. 78^{68} 87^{2}) and in the whole attitude of Judaism toward the ritual and the temple. The exact nature of the act of profanation here condemned is indicated in the succeeding sentence. The view that the sin of the people brings profanation upon the sanctuary is one that is characteristic of Ezekiel and of the Holiness Code (Lv. 17–26). The presence of sinful people within the sacred precincts contaminates the whole place. Some would interpret the "holiness of Yahweh" here as indicative not of the sanctuary, but of Israel itself.* But then we should have expected "holy to Yahweh," as always elsewhere (*e. g.* Lv. 21^{7}) when applied to Israel. Furthermore, "profaned" is always applied to things that were "holy" prior to the profanation, and Israel was hardly so classified by our prophet. The holiness of Israel is always something for which she is destined, not something she has ever actually attained or possessed.—*He has married the daughter of a strange god*] The use of the singular number seems to render it difficult to understand this as referring primarily to literal marriages between the men of Judah and idolatrous women, though such marriages undoubtedly took place; *cf.* Ezr. $9^{2\,ff.}$ $10^{18\,f.}$ Ne. 10^{31} $15^{23\,ff.}$. It is more natural to interpret the statement as meaning that an alliance has practically been made between Judah and some people that does not worship Yahweh through the common celebration of such marriages. The alliance of Yahweh's nation with foreign nations was always opposed by the prophets, on the ground that it involved disloyalty to and lack of trust in Yahweh, as well as because of its tendency to introduce idolatry into Judah; *cf.* Ho. 7^{11} $8^{8\,ff.}$ Is. $18^{1\,ff.}$ 20. The contest of Yahwism with idolatry was by no means brought to an end by the exile. It was a constant menace to Yahwism even up to the time of the Maccabaean revolt. This is shown by the repeated attacks made upon it by exilic and post-exilic prophets (Is. $65^{3\,ff.\,11}$ Je. $44^{15\,ff.}$ Zc. $13^{2\,ff.}$) and by the fact that the Jewish colony in Southern Egypt shared its offerings, as late as 420

* So *e. g.* Or., Dr., *et al.*.

B.C. or thereabouts, among three deities, viz. Yahu, Išm-Bethel, and Anath-Bethel.* The admission of idolatrous women into the community and the recognition of foreign gods, which was involved in these mixed marriages, are the facts that constitute the basis of the charge that Judah has defiled the temple of Yahweh.—**12.** *May Yahweh cut off for the man who does this awaker and answerer from the tents of Jacob*] The individualistic form of this malediction shows that the sin of Judah referred to in v. [11] was one arising out of the acts of various individuals and that the only way to bring it to an end is by dealing with the individuals involved. Unfortunately the text and meaning of the words rendered "awaker and answerer" are obscure. In general, it seems as though they must include or characterise the whole of the transgressor's family. The destruction of the sinner and all his kin is apparently asked for. The use of the word "tents" suggests the possibility that the terms "awaker and answerer" may have had some connection with camp-life. Or they may refer to the arousing of the family in the morning. An interesting parallel from the Arabic is afforded by the phrase, "there is not in the city a caller, nor is there a responder," meaning that none have been left alive.† This general meaning has been marvellously handled by some interpreters; *e. g.* man is here indicated as distinguished from animals, which wake indeed, but do not answer; ‡ or, with the following clause included, the prophet refers to the child so young that it only awakens, the child slightly older who awakes and answers, and the adults who worship, *i. e.* the whole of the man's family.§ But the infant of the first few weeks would hardly be called an "awaker." The correct element in this latter interpretation is the feeling that the language must be limited in its scope to the family of the offender. Other meanings proposed, without change of text, have been "teacher and scholar";** "son and grandson";†† "master and servant"; ‡‡ "stranger and kinsman." §§ Efforts at

* *V*. Papyrus 18, col. VII, lines 4–6, published in Sachau's *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka* (1911).

† Cited by Ges. (*Thesaurus*, p. 1004); and also Woolf, *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, for 1900, p. 11. *Cf.* also Torrey, *JBL*. XXIV (1905), 176–178.

‡ Umbreit. § Köh.. ** 𝔙, Jer., Hi.. †† 𝔖 𝔗, Ew..

‡‡ Cal.. §§ Yahuda, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XVI, 264.

emendation have been made, to wit, "root and branch";* "lad and lass"; † "witness and respondent," ‡ to which Marti rightly objects that in such case we should have expected, not "tents of Jacob," but "gates of his city," or some tribunal of justice. Moreover, not every one was engaged in lawsuits; hence the expression is not sufficiently comprehensive. Still others abandon the two words as unintelligible.§—*And one bringing an offering to Yahweh of hosts*] This is a comprehensive summary, since any individual of adult age, man or woman, could bring an offering to Yahweh and was under obligation so to do. This means, therefore, practically the extermination of the entire family of the guilty man.—**13.** *And this again ye do —ye cover the altar of Yahweh with tears*] A strong figure expressive of the intensity of zeal with which they seek Yahweh's favour. *Cf.* 1 K. 18^{25-29}. "Again" is logical rather than chronological, though some would make it mean "the second time" (viz. Ne. $13^{23\,ff.}$), the first time being that related in Ezr. 9 and 10.**—*With weeping and groaning*] Probably an expansion of the original by some reader.†† It adds nothing essential and is awkwardly placed in the sentence.—*Because there is no more any turning unto the offering or any receiving of favour at your hands*] This is the cause for the weeping of the people. Yahweh refuses to recognise their gifts and prayers because of their sins; and so they redouble their efforts to propitiate him, but do not forsake their sins. This interpretation seems more natural than that which refers the weeping to the divorced wives who come to Yahweh's altar with their grief and constitute an effectual obstacle to the bestowal of Yahweh's favour.‡‡ As a matter of fact, women were not allowed to approach the altar; yet the covering of the altar with tears is figurative in any case and the legitimacy of the figure does not depend upon the proximity of the women to the altar (*cf.* Hb. 2^{17}). The real cause of Yahweh's displeasure, however, is not the weeping of the women, but the materialism, sensuousness and cruelty of their husbands who

* Torrey (but abandoned by him in *JBL.* XXIV), Marti.
† Bachmann. ‡ We., *et al.*. § Wkl., *et al.*.
** So *e. g.* Hesselberg, Mau., Hd.. †† So Marti, Siev., Now.[K].
‡‡ *Contra* Rosenm., Hi., Mau., Hd., Schegg, Reinke, Köh., Ke., Hal., *et al.*.

make them weep. The view that the prophet is denouncing the women's custom of weeping for Tammuz or Adonis* is a curiosity of interpretation.—**14.** *And you say, Wherefore?*] A recurrence to the question and answer method of $1^{2.\ 6.\ 7}$. The question calls for an explanation of Yahweh's refusal to look upon the questioners with favour.—*Because Yahweh witnesses between thee and the wife of thy youth, against whom thou hast acted treacherously*] The only natural interpretation of this is that the men of Judah in large numbers have in mature life divorced (*cf.* 2^{16}) the wives whom they had married in the heyday of their youth. The occasion of these divorces, as appears from 2^{11}, was the desire to marry foreign women. It is true that the possession of a wife was no obstacle in the way of the contraction of a second marriage. Polygamy was the law of the land even down to the end of the Jewish state. The Talmud distinctly recognises it, in its prohibition of a larger number of wives than four to the ordinary Jewish citizen and eighteen for the king himself.† But in the post-exilic age it is quite clear that monogamy was looked upon as the ideal state of marriage (Gn. $2^{18 ff.}$ Pr. $5^{18 ff.}$ $31^{10 ff.}$ BS. 9^{1} 26^{1-3}) and was the actual condition in most families. Furthermore, the dismissal of the first wife may well have been a prerequisite to the new marriage laid down by the relatives of the coveted bride, since the marriage is most easily accounted for as a means of securing influence with and favour from powerful foreigners. In a polygamous family, the first wives would naturally hold the place of honour and power. Torrey would make the term "wife of thy youth" designate the Yahweh religion, which was being abandoned by the Jews in favour of the worship of other gods.‡ But this would be the only case of such a figurative use of the word "wife" and it is without any true analogy. Hosea's designation of the relation between Yahweh and Israel as that of husband and wife was but the special application to a particular case of a terminology that was common in Semitic religion, where the conception of a deity as husband constantly recurs. In any case, the designation of a god as the nation's husband and that of a religion as the nation's wife are

* So Wkl.. † Tract *Sanhedrin*, ch. II, § 21. ‡ So also Wkl.

two totally different things; and the latter figure is certainly a somewhat unnatural one. The ordinary view has been objected to on the ground that "daughter of a strange god" would mean a goddess* and not an idolatrous woman. But the point is not well taken. By the same reasoning, "sons of Yahweh" (Dt. 14^{1} Ho. 1^{10} Is. 1^{2}) would be gods, though the term is indisputably applied to the Israelites. In accordance with an idiomatic usage of "son" and "daughter," illustrated by the phrases "son of strength," *i. e.* a strong man, and "daughter of Belial," *i. e.* a wicked woman, the phrase "daughter of a strange god" is equivalent to "an idolatrous woman." In view of such passages as Nu. 21^{29} Dt. 32^{19} and Je. 2^{27}, there can be no reasonable doubt but that this is the sense. The first marriage of a Hebrew was ordinarily contracted at a very early age. The Talmud declares the boy accursed who is not married by the time he is twenty years of age.† In Palestine, Russia and Poland at the present time, the boys frequently marry at the age of thirteen or fourteen and the girls even younger; *cf.* Is. 54^{6}. Every contract of whatever sort was concluded "before God" as a witness; *i. e.* God was called upon to wreak vengeance upon either of the parties that should break the contract; *cf.* Gn. $31^{49 f.}$. Hence, the wrath of God must inevitably rest upon these men faithless to their marital contracts.—*Though she is thy comrade and the wife of thy covenant*] The word rendered "comrade" is, literally, "one bound to thee." No English noun exactly reproduces its significance. In the masculine form, it is applied to Yahweh in Je. 3^{4}, as "the comrade of my youth"; *cf.* Pr. 2^{17}. The "wife of thy covenant" is equivalent to "the wife to whom thou hast pledged loyalty and support." For "covenant" in the sense of "pact" or "agreement," *cf.* 2 K. 11^{4} Ho. 10^{4} Jb. 31^{1}. It seems unnecessary to read into "covenant" so much as is required to make it mean "thy true Israelite compatriot." ‡ The word is not always confined to strictly religious contracts; § and, as a matter of fact, it is applied once, at least, to a figurative marriage (Ez. 16^{8}). The proposal to drop this clause as a gloss** has no

* Wkl..

† Tract *Qiddusin*, I, § 29.

‡ *Contra* Kraetzschmar (*Bundesvorstellung im A. T.* 240 *f.*), Now., Isop., Du.[Pro].

§ *Cf.* Valeton in *ZAW.*, XIII, 262.

** Marti, Siev., Now.[K].

real force, considerations based upon poetical form having no warrant in this context. The clause clinches the accusation most effectively.

15. The beginning of this verse as found in 𝔐 is hopelessly obscure. As rendered in RV. it runs, *And did he not make one, although he had the residue of the Spirit? And wherefore one? He sought a godly seed.*] This is a possible translation of 𝔐, though there is no indication that the first clause is interrogative and the "wherefore" of the second clause is regularly represented by a different Hebrew word. But as so translated, what does the passage mean? To whom does the pronoun "he" refer? Does "he" indicate the same person in all three cases? If so, and if God be the person in mind, what is meant by his having the "residue" or "remnant of the Spirit"? In any case, "remnant of the Spirit" is scarcely a Hebrew point of view, and it lacks all analogy. If the Spirit of Yahweh be thought of as a personal manifestation, as this translation seems to suggest, how can it at the same time be presented as an abstract quality or be spoken of quantitatively? Could the Hebrews think of the Spirit as limited in amount? Furthermore, the bearing of this passage, as thus conceived, upon the argument of the writer regarding divorce is hard to discover. RVm. offers, "And not one hath done so who had a residue of the spirit. Or what? Is there one that seeketh a godly seed?" This is better, in that it carries on the preceding thought without any hiatus. But "so" is missing from 𝔐, the "spirit" referred to is wholly undefined, the phrase "residue of the spirit" is without analogy or parallel, and the transition to the latter half of the passage is too abrupt. The passage has been subjected to many widely differing interpretations, of which only a few may be cited. Some make God the subject and treat "one" as equivalent to "one flesh" (Gn. 2), interpreting thus, "God made Adam and Eve one flesh; he might have given Adam many wives, for he had plenty of spiritual essence wherewith to furnish them souls; but he sought a godly race." * Others make "one" the subject and identify it with Abraham, interpreting thus, "Did not Abraham put away

* Ra., Hd..

Hagar and yet retain the divine spirit? So the people inquire. The prophet replies, Yes; but he did it from an entirely different motive from that which actuates you. He sought godly seed; you, the gratification of your own lust or ambition." * Another interpretation is "Abraham did not do so (*i. e.* send away Sarah, though she was old and childless), and yet an heir (שאר) was his desire. And what was he seeking? A godly seed." † Still others have made it more general in scope, viz. "No one has done it (*i. e.* divorced his wife) who had a remnant of the spirit. Why should any one do it, who sought seed of God?" ‡ Owing to the obscurity of 𝔐, many attempts have been made to emend the text (*v. i.*). The reading proposed by Wellhausen has met with more approval than any other, viz. "Has not the same God given us breath and sustained us? And what does he desire? Seed of God!" But this translation is hard to obtain from the Hebrew original suggested for it (*v. i.*). One of the most recent conjectures yields, "Not one who had a remnant of moral sense has done it. How is it with that one? He it is who seeks a godly seed." § The change of text involved in this is slight, but the pronounced and sudden shift of standpoint in the word "one" is most remarkable and unnatural. No satisfactory solution of the problem of this verse has yet been found. For further suggestions, *v. i.*.—*Then take heed to your spirit and let no one act treacherously toward the wife of his youth*] *Cf.* v. [14]. "Spirit" is here apparently equivalent to "character," "purpose" or "will," as *e. g.* in Je. 51^{1} Hg. 1^{14} 1 K. 21^{5} Ps. 51^{12}. This is an admonition growing out of v. [15 a], whatever that passage may mean.—**16.** *For one who hates and sends away covers his clothing with violence, says Yahweh of hosts*] 𝔐 inserts after "sends away" the phrase "says Yahweh, God of Israel." This is probably a gloss; ** for it separates the protasis from the apodosis, constitutes the only occurrence of this title of Yahweh in Malachi, and is superfluous alongside of the immediately following affirmation of divine authority. The figure "cover the clothing with violence" occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. The basis of the figure

* De Wette, Köh., Ke.. † Hal.. ‡ L. de Dieu, Rosenm..
§ Du.[Pro]. ** So We., Now., Bu., Siev..

seems to lie in an ancient custom whereby the casting of one's garment over a woman was tantamount to claiming her as a wife (*cf.* Ez. 16^{8} Dt. 22^{30} Ru. 3^{9}).* The first two words of this verse as found in 𝔐 are unintelligible in this context. 𝔐 can only be rendered, "He hates putting away." But "he" must refer to Yahweh who is himself the speaker. RV.'s rendering, "I hate," involves a change of text, which is on the whole less likely than that followed here. Other references to wives as hated by their husbands are Gn. 29^{31} Dt. 21^{15-17}.—*So take heed to your spirit and act not treacherously*] This is a repetition of v. ^{15c} and may be but a variant.† The section would end impressively without it.

Vv. $^{10-16}$ present the strongest and most outspoken condemnation of the divorce evil that the Old Testament offers. They furnish an illustration of the fact that the laws of a land are never up to the moral standards of its best citizens. In early Israel, divorce seems to have been the exclusive privilege of the man and to have been permissible on the slightest grounds. The Deuteronomic law took a forward step in requiring the husband to give the divorced wife a bill of divorcement (Dt. $24^{1\,ff.}$) and in prohibiting the remarriage of the two in case the woman should marry another husband and be again made a widow, either by the death of her second husband or by divorce. These restrictions were both for the purpose of compelling some consideration on the part of the man before he divorces his wife, by making his action more formal and public on the one hand and, on the other, irrevocable. Furthermore, the right of divorce was denied to the man in two cases, viz. when he had been forced to marry a virgin whom he had seduced (Dt. 22^{29}) and when he had slandered his newly married wife (22^{19}). These laws and the protest of our prophet show that the marital rights of women were slowly emerging in Israel as elsewhere. Mohammed sought to check the frequency of divorce by exactly the opposite method, viz. by prohibiting the husband from taking back his divorced wife until after she had first lived with another man as wife. This law of the Koran gave rise to gross abuse of the marriage

* *V.* WRS. *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, 1st ed., p. 87. † So Siev.

rite. Neither the Jewish nor the Mohammedan law brought much real relief. Divorce continued to be the right of the man alone in Israel, was checked by but few legal obstacles, and was indulged in liberally.

The general interpretation of vv. $^{10-16}$ presented above has been attacked in recent times from three different directions. GASm., followed by Marti, Siev. and Kent, would set aside vv. $^{11.12}$ as an intrusion into the original prophecy. The grounds urged in support of this are (1) that they break the connection between v. ^{10} and v. ^{13}; (2) that their interest is not in ethics as in v. ^{10}, but in cultus; (3) that they deal with the subject of mixed marriages, whereas vv. $^{10.13-16}$ are concerned with divorce; and (4) that their attitude toward foreigners is contrary to that of Malachi (*cf.* 1^{11}). In reply to these considerations, it may be said (1) that 1^{11} probably has no reference to foreigners (*v.* the note on that passage); (2) that it is difficult to see why the same writer may not have both ethical and religious interests and may not present both of them in treating different aspects of one and the same subject; the two are certainly not mutually exclusive in vv. $^{10-16}$; (3) the questions of divorce and mixed marriages were so inextricably intermingled in actual practice that in discussing either the other was involved. They are not two separate and distinct subjects, but two phases of one subject, viz. the obligation of the Jew to be loyal to his people and his God. Read from this point of view, there is no lack of continuity in the progress of the thought.

Wkl. sees in this passage an evidence that the prophecy of Mal. originated in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The community is split into two parties, the pious who keep in the old paths and the apostates who are forsaking Yahwism and going over to Greek ways and thoughts. This passage denounces this movement, and records the erection of an altar to Mešammem-el and the observance of the Adonis cult. But in order to obtain such surprising results, Wkl. has to posit a wholesale corruption of the text, so great, indeed, that he is unable to suggest the necessary corrections, though he is quite sure as to the general sense of the passage. Methods of this kind can hardly be deemed scientific.

The third attempt to displace the traditional interpretation is that of Torrey (1898). He was the first after 𝔊 to suggest that the prophet's attack was not upon mixed marriages or divorce, but upon apostacy to a foreign cult. On this basis, "daughter of a foreign god" becomes "cult of a foreign god," and "wife of thy youth" becomes the religion of Yahweh to which Israel had formerly been true. But, as has been pointed out above, the language will not bear this figurative interpretation. Furthermore, the only satisfactory interpretation of v. ^{12} makes

it threaten the destruction of the guilty individual with his family and strongly supports the literal treatment of the whole passage.

10. The first two clauses of this v. are transposed by 𝔊$^{\text{ABY Heid.}}$ 𝔏 𝔄, Eth., HP. 22, 23, 26, 36, 51, 62, 68, 86, 95, 106, 114, 147, 185, 198, 233, 238, Ignatius, Origen, Chrysostom, Athanasius, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. This is probably due to a desire to give God the first place, the word "father" being interpreted of Abraham, or some other man. 𝔊$^{\text{N. c. b}}$ 𝔖$^{\text{H}}$ agree with the order of 𝔐. 𝔊$^{\text{Bo.}}$ om. v.^{10a}. 𝔊 puts all the suffixes in the 2d p. pl., probably to avoid including the prophet himself with the guilty ones.—נִבְגַּד] Rd. נִבְגֹּד, with 4 codd. of Kenn., 𝔖 𝔗 and most interpreters. The Niphal of בגד does not occur, nor would it be fitting here. The impf. and inf. cstr. elsewhere always have ō.—**11.** בגדה] Probably an error for בָּגַד, in view of חִלֵּל in the next sentence, where יהודה is again the subject. The use of the fem. is, of course, permissible (*cf.* 1^{4}, where אֱדוֹם is treated as fem.), and may have been chosen here because of the series of fem. forms in which it occurs. The common explanation (so *e. g.* Mau., Hd., Köh., Ke., Isop.) is that in the fem. form the land is thought of, and in the masc., the people; but this is a bit artificial.—אהב ובעל] Rd. אָהֵבוּ בעל, with Bu.; ובעל yields a poor sequence of tenses. Moreover, בעל וגו׳ does not add a new fact, but merely defines the content of the preceding phrase more explicitly.—ובעל בת אל נכר] 𝔊 *καὶ ἐπετήδευσεν εἰς θεοὺς ἀλλοτρίους*, paraphrasing freely, perhaps to avoid the mention of marriages with aliens. 𝔊$^{\text{N c. b}}$ om. *εἰς*; *cf.* 𝔏 *et affectavit deos alienos*. 𝔖 *and worshipped strange gods*. Wkl. ופעל בית־אל נכר, "and has built an idolatrous baityl," *i. e.* a shrine. Che. ויאכל בית־אל נ׳, "and has eaten in the house of a foreign god." H. Isaacs (*JQR.* XI, 526), וּבָא אֶל־בֵּית אל נ׳.—**12.** לאיש] 𝔊 𝔙 treat ל as introducing the object of the verb, a common usage in Aram. and Syr..—ער ועונה] 𝔖 𝔗 = *and his son and his son's son*. 𝔙 *magistrum et discipulum*. 𝔏 *et humilis*, apparently omitting ער; so also Eth.. 𝔊 *ἕως καὶ ταπεινωθῇ* = עַד וענה; hence We. עֵד ועונה (*cf.* 3^{5} Jb. 13^{22} BS. 42^{6}); so GASm., Now., BDB., Oort, Bu., van H.. Kenn. 99 also has עד. But it would be a strange social order in which every man was provided with a "Kläger und Verteidiger" and would look upon the loss of these as a terrible calamity. Torrey שֹׁרֶשׁ וְעָנָף (*cf.* 3^{19}, where 𝔗 renders exactly as it does here); so Marti, Kent. But this is too wide a variation from 𝔐, and Torrey himself has since abandoned it (*v. s.*). Bachmann נַעַר וְנַעֲרָה. Gr. כָּעֵר ויאונן; *cf.* Gn. 38^{9}. עֵר occurs again in Ct. 5^{2} and is the regular form for the prtc. of the stative verb; *cf.* מֵת. Whatever its precise meaning (*v. s.*), the phrase is an example of the idiom in which everything is subsumed under two opposite categories, *e. g.* טוב וָרָע; עבר ושב, Zc. 9^{8}; עצור ועזוב, Dt. 32^{36}. The scope of the phrase is here clearly confined to the family or friends of the offender.—**13.** שנית] 𝔊 *ἃ ἐμίσουν* =

שְׂנֵאתִי; so Wkl., Che., Bu.. Marti om. it as a gloss intended to restore the connection between v. [10] and v. [13] after it had been broken by the insertion of vv. [11. 12]; so Now.[K], Kent.—כסות] Rd. תְּכַסּוּ, foll. 𝔊 ἐκαλύπτετε; so Aq., Θ 𝔙. Some prefer כַּסִּיתֶם; *e. g.* Bachmann, van H., Isop.; but the impf. is better as an explanation of the preceding impf. תעשו. Marti, וִיכַסּוּ, which yields a poor consecution of tenses.—מֵאֵין] 𝔊 ἐκ κόπων = מֵאָוֶן. Wkl. וְאֵין. Bu. מֵאֵן. Many interpreters make this a result clause, viz. "so that there is no," etc., giving 'מ the same force as in Zp. 2[5]. But the line of thought is clearer and stronger if 'מ be given causal significance; *v. s.*.—מידכם] 𝔊 𝔖 Θ = *from your hands;* but this does not call for a different text, for the Heb. often uses the sg. where we should use a pl.; *contra* Isop..—ואמרתם] 𝔊 𝔗 = *and if thou sayest.*—עַל כִּי] 𝔊[AFΓ] and HP. 40, 49, 106 apparently om.; but this is probably due to an inner-Greek error of ὁ for ὅτι.—העיד] Bu. עֵד.

15. This is unquestionably the most difficult v. in Mal.; *v. s.*.—ולא] 𝔙 *nonne* = הֲלֹא; so 𝔖 and We., Oort, Now., van H., Isop.. Siev. וָאֵל.—ולא אחד] 𝔊[B] HP. 48, 233, καὶ οὐ καλόν; 𝔊[ℵ c. b] HP. 86, καὶ οὐ καλός. 𝔊[AQΓ Held.] HP. 22, 26, 36, 42, 49, 51, 62, 91, 95, 97, 130, 147, 185, 228, 233, 240, ουκαλλος, probably to be read as οὐκ ἄλλος, with 𝔖[H] 𝔗 ℭ[Bo.] 𝔄, Eth., Arm.. 𝔊[F] HP. 23, 40, 106, οὐκ ἄλλως or οὐ κάλλως. The proper disposition of this indefinite "one" is the most difficult problem in the interpretation of v. [15]; *v. s.*. It is in an unusual position for the subject of a verbal sentence, unless it is intended to be emphatic; and it is just as abnormal a position for the object.—עשה] 𝔖 *was there not one man?* either omitting 'ע or else reading it as איש. Van H. עָשָׂם. Du.[Pro.] עָשָׂהוּ, taking ו from the foll. word.—וּשְׁאָר] Van H. שְׁאַר, We. וַיִּשְׁאַר; so Oort, Now., Isop.. But the resulting idiom, in the sense given to it by We., is without any parallel in Heb.. וישאר רוח could only mean, "and left (or kept) spirit (or breath) over"; it could never mean "and maintained breath (or spirit)." Further, the idiom עשה רוח is harsh; we should expect נתן, נפח, or the like. It is possible that שאר should be אָשֵׁר; *cf.* the opposite transposition in Mi. 3[3]. If, in addition, we accept 𝔖's treatment of עשה and read איש in its place, also dropping אחד as a dittog. from the succeeding האחד, we get fairly good sense, viz. "there is not a man who has moral sense (= spirit)." This suits the preceding context well, and disposes of the difficult "remnant of spirit." But the connection with what follows is not sufficiently close. 𝔖, however, furnishes a way of escape here also, in that it omits וּמָה. Thus the whole sentence becomes, "there is not one who has moral sense, viz. one seeking a godly seed." ומה is easily accounted for as a marginal query by some puzzled reader, and ה of האחד may well be due to dittog. from ומה. *Cf.* my presentation of this reconstruction in *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, April, 1912.—רוח] Van H. וְרוּחַ. Bu. הֵנִיחַ; *cf.* 2 S. 16[11].—לו] We.

לָנוּ; so Oort, Now., Siev., Isop..—ומה האחר] 𝔖 om. ומה. 𝔊 *καὶ εἴπατε τί ἄλλο ἢ κ. τ. λ.* 𝔙 *et quid unus . . . nisi.* Bu. ומה הָא.—מבקש זרע אלהים] 𝔊 *σπέρμα ζητεῖ ὁ θεός.* 𝔖 *one sought seed from God.* 𝔙 *quaerit nisi semen Dei.* Riessler, on the basis of 𝔊, restores the preceding five words thus, ואמרתם מה אחרת מְזֻרַע מבקש אלהים. But 𝔊's *καὶ εἴπατε* is almost certainly due to interpretation, and not to the presence of a Heb. equivalent for it; and the same thing will account for the position of *σπέρμα* in 𝔊. The sense secured is not sufficiently strong to carry these textual changes.—ונשמרתם ברוחכם] Bu. וְנִשְׁמַר בְּרוּחוֹ; so Now.[K](?).—ובאשת נעריך] Rd., with 𝔖, ואיש באשת נְעוּרָיו; so Gr., Now., Marti, Isop.(?), Du.[Pro.].—יבגד] 𝔊 𝔗 𝔙, 9 codd. of Kenn. and 6 of de R. = תבגד; so We., Oort, Now., Dr., Or., Siev., van H..—**16.** כִּי־שָׂנֵא שַׁלַּח] 𝔊 *ἀλλὰ ἐὰν μισήσας ἐξαποστείλῃς.* 𝔖 om.. 𝔙 *cum odio habueris dimitte;* so 𝔗, changing what is otherwise a denunciation of divorce into an explicit authorisation thereof. We. אֶשְׂנָא ש׳. Van H. treats שָׂנֵא as equivalent to שֹׂנֵא (but everywhere else the form of the prtc. is שׂנֵא) and makes it the subject of ש׳, read as שִׁלַּח. It seems better to follow Du.[Pro.] in keeping שָׂנֵא as a pf. and reading שִׁלַּח, in asyndetic construction with it. This involves no further change in the sentence, as does the reading of We..—וְכִסָּה] 𝔊 *καὶ καλύψει.* 𝔙 *operiet autem.* 𝔖 = לא יכסה; so 𝔗. Oort, וְכִסּוּת. We. וְכַסֵּה; so Now., Marti, Siev., Isop..—לְבוּשׁוֹ] 𝔗 = לבושך. 𝔊 *τὰ ἐνθυμήματά σου* (𝔊[Y] HP. 22, 36, 51, 62, 86, 95, 147, 185, 238, *ὑμῶν*); probably an error for *ἐνδύματα*, which was restored here by Cappellus and also by Grabe (1720), with the support of the daughter versions of 𝔊, viz. 𝔖 𝔄, Eth., and the Georgian. Some commentators (*e. g.* Hi., Mau.) have interpreted ל׳ as "wife," after the analogy of the Ar. *libāsun; cf.* Kōran, Sura II, 183, where speaking of wives it is said, "they are your garment and you are theirs." But this is totally without support in OT. usage.—תבגדו] 𝔊[Y] adds *τὴν συνθήκην*; and HP. 95, 185, *τὴν διαθήκην.*

§ 5. THE NEAR APPROACH OF THE DAY OF JUDGMENT (2^{17}–3^{6}).

The prophet cites another cause for Yahweh's failure to bless Israel, viz. his people have lost all faith in their God. Therefore, he will send his messenger to prepare for the coming of the day of judgment. Then will there be a purification of the priestly order and a full exposure and condemnation of sinners of every kind. For Yahweh is unalterably opposed to sin, and the sinners in Israel must perish.

2[17]. *You have made Yahweh weary by your statements*] *i. e.* the patience of Yahweh is exhausted; *cf.* Is. 43[24]. The prophet addresses the people in general, not the pious in Israel,* nor the glaringly wicked in particular, as is shown by the nature of the charges in v.[5]. Their attitude of mind Yahweh can no longer endure. The truly pious are, of course, exempted from this accusation; but their numbers are so few as to make any careful discrimination in statement unnecessary in a general proposition such as this.—*Yet you say, How have we made him weary?*] The question and answer style is here resorted to for the opening of a new phase of the discourse, just as in 3[7b. 13].—*In that you say, Every one that does evil is good in the eyes of Yahweh and he takes pleasure in them*] *Cf.* Zp. 1[12]. The experiences of Israel had been so hard and sad during the exilic and early post-exilic years that faith in Yahweh and his goodness was at a low ebb. Many were ready to take the position here stated, viz. that Yahweh's influence was exerted in behalf of the wicked as over against the righteous. The favour of Yahweh was looked for in the form of material prosperity of every sort. But very little of this had come in Israel's way of recent years. Hence arose the skepticism regarding Yahweh's interest in the righteous; "the earth is given into the hands of the wicked" (Jb. 9[24]). The structure of the sentence lays emphasis upon "them." Yahweh's delight is evidently not in the good, as would be expected, but in the bad.—*Or, Where is the God of justice?*] This is another expression of the same attitude of mind. The moral government of the world is out of joint. The prophet's contemporaries were for the most part unable to see the hand of God in the movements of their times. It seemed to them that he had departed from the scene, leaving the interests of his people uncared for. Were not they the righteous? Why did the wicked prosper? It is not at all unlikely that there is a note of sarcasm in the people's question. The prophets had constantly emphasised the insistence of Yahweh upon justice as the indispensable prerequisite to his favour. What now has become of his much-vaunted sense of justice? Is it not time that he exercised a little of it himself?—**3**[1]. *Behold, I*

* *Contra* van H.

am about to send my messenger and he will prepare the way before me] This is the answer to the skeptical question of the people. The wrongs of the present age are to be righted by Yahweh in person, and he is even now on the point of sending out his forerunner. The long-looked-for day of Yahweh is about to dawn. From earliest times, this day had been reckoned upon as the panacea for all ills; *cf.* Am. 5^{18}.* Our prophet is but reiterating a promise that had been made and remade in every time of distress and crisis. He gives to it, however, not the significance that it had had in the popular mythical-religious thought, but the deeply ethical value that had been ineffaceably stamped upon it by Amos and succeeding prophets who had developed and enriched the idea prior to the exile. The representation that a preliminary work is to be carried through by Yahweh's agent before the coming of the great day itself is found only here and in $4^{5.\,6}$, though the thought of preparing the way of Yahweh appears in Is. 40^3, in a somewhat similar connection.† This representation was not original with this prophet, nor confined to him, as is clear from the last phrase of the announcement in this verse. The identity of the messenger is not revealed. It seems to be taken for granted as known by the prophet's contemporaries. Interpreters have sought to find here a prediction of the coming of John the Baptist;‡ or of the prophet promised in Is. $40^{3\,ff.}$ and identified with Elijah in Mal. 4^5;§ or of the death-angel;** or of the mythical Messiah ben Joseph of the rabbis, who was to precede the Messiah ben David.†† Others have seen in it a figurative embodiment of the whole line of the prophets;‡‡ or an ideal figure;§§ or a play upon the name of our prophet.*** It seems, on the face of it, most natural to interpret the statement in the light of 4^5, which declares that Elijah will return before the coming of the day of Yahweh and will perform the

* *V.* J. M. Powis Smith, "The Day of Yahweh," *AJTh.*, V, 505 *ff.*.

† The figure is borrowed from the oriental custom of sending out messengers to the various towns and villages through which a king was about to journey, who should notify the inhabitants of his approach and thus enable them to prepare for a proper reception to him.

‡ So Theodore of Mopsuestia, Ephraem Syrus, Jer., Theodoret, Cyril of Alexandria, Origen, Rosenm., Mau., Hd., Reinke, Ke., Isop., *et al.*.

§ Ki., Pres., Schegg, Now., van H., *et al.*.

** Ra..

†† AE..

‡‡ Eichhorn, Theiner, Hengstenberg.

§§ Dr..

*** Or..

very same sort of work that is assigned to "my messenger" here. But it must be borne in mind that $4^{5f.}$ is a later addition (*v. i.*); and, consequently, is not a reliable index to the thought of our prophet upon this question. No sure identification of "my messenger" is therefore possible. It is not at all unlikely that the prophet had no specific personality in mind.—*And suddenly will the Lord whom you are seeking come to his temple*] The title "Lord" evidently indicates Yahweh as is shown by the additional statement that he is the one for whose appearance the people are longing.* His coming, notwithstanding the preparation made for it, will seem sudden and unexpected. For the same attitude of longing for the coming of the day of Yahweh, *cf.* Am. 5^{18}.—*And the messenger of the covenant in whom ye delight—behold, he comes, says Yahweh of hosts*] This "messenger" can hardly be identical with the forerunner, viz. "my messenger," at the opening of the verse;† for his coming is here made simultaneous with that of "the Lord," who can hardly be other than Yahweh himself, and the coming of "my messenger" is explicitly announced as preceding that of Yahweh. It is not at all unlikely, indeed, that "the messenger of the covenant" is here confused with Yahweh,‡ as elsewhere the "messenger of Yahweh" is confused with Yahweh; *e. g.* Ju. $6^{11.12.14.15.16.20}$ $13^{3.13ff.}$ 2 S. 24^{16} 2 K. 19^{35}; in the latter two passages his function is punitive as here. This is the only occurrence of the title "messenger of the covenant." Consequently it is impossible to tell what the exact significance of the term is. Some would make this messenger to be the guardian angel of the Jewish community.§ Others look upon him as the original Baal-berith worshipped by the Shechemites (Ju. 8^{33} $9^{4.46}$), but now subordinated to Yahweh as one of his angels.** The specific function of the angel here, if distinct from that of Yahweh himself, is not indicated. Nor is it stated what

* Du.'s hypothesis of a special "lord of the temple" distinct from Yahweh himself is gratuitous. Du. would also make "my messenger," "the Lord" and "the messenger of the covenant" to be all one and the same person. But this is to postpone the appearance of Yahweh himself upon the scene until v. ^{5} and requires him to do over again the very same work as that already done by his supposed forerunner in v. ^{3}.

† *Contra* Hi., Mau., Marti, Du.^{Pro}.

‡ So Köh., Ke., We., Sm. 124, Marti, Dr., Isop., van H., Hal..

§ Kraetzschmar, *Bundesvorstellung im A. T.*, 237 *ff*..

** Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, 202.

"covenant" is meant. It may be the long-established covenant between Yahweh and Israel; or it may be a new covenant marking the opening of a new age.* Grammatically, the antecedent of the relative pronoun might be either "messenger of the covenant" or "covenant" itself. But in view of the parallel phrase "whom you seek" attached to "Lord," it is probable that "in whom you delight" describes the messenger.—**2.** *And who can endure the day of his coming?*] The day of Yahweh was said by Amos to be a day of "darkness and not light; even very dark and no brightness in it" (5^{20}); and by Zephaniah to be "a day of wrath, a day of trouble and distress, a day of wasteness and desolation" (1^{15}). Malachi presents a similar view.—*And who can stand when he appears?*] Lit. "who will be the one standing when," etc.. Nobody will be able to hold his ground before the dread judge; all will lie prostrate and powerless before him.—*For he will be like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap*] The processes of smelting and washing at once suggest the thought of purification, rather than total destruction. The day of Yahweh is to be a day of judgment.—**3.** *And he will sit as a refiner and cleanser*] 𝔐 adds "of silver." But this is probably due to dittography from a following line or to a gloss; since the word "cleanse" is hardly applied appropriately to the purification of metals and is nowhere else so used.—*And he will cleanse the sons of Levi*] This is the first direct mention of the people over whom the judgment will be held. Contrary to the general expectation, the chastisement and purification are to begin with that section of the community most ostensibly religious. The necessity for such a cleansing process among the Levites has been clearly indicated in the charges preferred against the priesthood in 1^{6}–2^{9}. The purifying work will begin at the fountain-head of the religious life of Judah. The religious teachers of the land must be pure, if the people at large are to become pleasing to Yahweh.—*And he will refine them like gold and like silver*] The refining of precious metals by the purgation of fire is intended to represent the most thorough-going purification conceivable.—*And they will become for Yahweh those who bring near an offering in righteousness*] *i. e.* in accordance with

* Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, 202.

all the requirements of the ritual; *cf.* Ps. 51[19]. The Levites, who have been criminally careless in the conduct of the sacrifices, will henceforth be a body of men devoted heart and soul to the proper performance of the sacrificial ceremonial. *Cf.* 1[8. 13. 14] 2[8]. Most Roman Catholic scholars regard this as a prediction of the offering of the Eucharist.—**4.** *And the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing to Yahweh as in the days of old and as in former years*] The particular period to which reference is made cannot be known. It may be, indeed, that the writer is simply reflecting a common view that "the good old times" were all that could be desired, whereas the present age leaves everything to be desired. Certain it is, however, that not since the days of the Conquest had Israel been pleasing to Yahweh, according to the estimate of the pre-exilic prophets; *cf.* Ho. 11[1] Am. 3[1 f.] Mi. 3[9-12] Is. 1[10 ff.] Je. 7[21-26]. The emphasis placed upon sacrifice and ritual here is in striking contrast to the depreciation of ritual at the hands of the earlier prophets.—**5.** *And I will draw near unto you for judgment*] The prophet, speaking in Yahweh's person, addresses the people in general. The day of Yahweh holds little comfort for them.—*And I will be a swift witness against the sorcerers*] Sorcery and other low forms of religion were always opposed by the prophets as hated by Yahweh; *cf.* Ex. 7[11] 22[17] Dt. 18[10] Lv. 20[27] 1 S. 15[23] Dn. 2[2 ff.]. Yet such practices continued in vogue among the people down to the end; *cf.* Acts 8[9] 13[6] and Josephus, *Ant.* XX, 6 and *Wars*, II, 12, 23.—*And the adulterers*] This epithet may describe those who are unfaithful to Yahweh in that they give themselves to the worship of other gods (*cf.* Ho. 2[2 ff.] Ez. 16[15 ff.]); but more probably it applies to those who were living with foreign wives, after having divorced their native Hebrew wives; *cf.* 2[14]. It is scarcely probable that unmitigated adultery was so prevalent as to justify its being listed as one of the chief crimes in a charge like this.—*And against those swearing to falsehood*] Perjury is frequently condemned in the Old Testament; *cf.* Lv. 19[12] Je. 29[23] Ex. 20[16] Dt. 19[16 ff.] 23[1] Pr. 19[5]. Those who have hitherto escaped detection will now be pitilessly exposed and punished.—*And against those oppressing the hireling, the widow and the fatherless*] These

classes are especial objects of solicitude in the Deuteronomic Code; *cf.* also Ex. $22^{21.\,23}$. Prophecy always stood upon the side of the poor and the weak, and represented Yahweh as their champion; *cf.* Am. $2^{6\,ff.}$ 8^{6} Mi. $2^{1\,ff.}$ $3^{1\,ff.}$ Is. 5^{8}. By this threat, the writer puts himself in line with his great prophetic predecessors and shows his concern for ethical righteousness as an essential element in religion, over and above ceremonial purity and perfection. The fulfilment of one's obligations to God does not release one from certain obligations to his fellow-men, but involves the full discharge of the latter as well as the former.—*And against those turning aside the stranger*] *i. e.* from justice; *cf.* Je. 7^{6} 22^{3} Ez. 22^{7} Zc. 7^{10}. The stranger, sojourner, or proselyte was especially subject to wrong because, as an alien in the community, he had few friends to guard his interests or avenge his injuries. Therefore, he was especially protected by legislation; *cf.* Dt. 14^{29} 24^{17} $26^{12\,f.}$ 27^{19} Ex. 20^{10} 23^{12} Lv. $19^{10.\,33\,f.}$ 23^{22}.—*And they do not fear me, says Yahweh of hosts*] These are the sins which Yahweh has denounced through his prophets for centuries. Yet the Israelites have acted apparently without any realisation whatsoever of the danger of incurring Yahweh's wrath on account of their failure to heed the word of Yahweh.—**6.** *But I, Yahweh, have not changed; therefore, you, O sons of Jacob, will be consumed*] If any of the guilty have thought that Yahweh has lost all his interest in righteousness and goodness (*v.* 2^{17}), they are now to be completely disabused of that error. The moral character of Yahweh remains unchanged; hence, sinners must undergo the punishment they so richly deserve. This, it is clear, is not an abstract proposition that Yahweh cannot change in any respect (*cf.* Heb. 13^{8} James 1^{17}), but simply a positive affirmation that he has not changed in this specific particular. The nearest approximation in the Old Testament to a comprehensive, theological statement of unchangeableness is Ps. $102^{26\,ff.}$; *cf.* Ps. $90^{1\,ff.}$ Dt. 33^{27} Is. 57^{15}. 𝔐 has the negative before the last verb here, viz. "not consumed." But this hardly satisfies the demands of the context, the sense being so difficult to attain on that basis that several interpreters abandon the effort.* Among the many in-

* So *e. g.* We., Now., Marti, Isop..

terpretations of 𝔐 that have been offered, attention may be called to three. The first finds here the thought that Israel owes its continued existence, notwithstanding its sins, to the fact that the unchanging purpose of Yahweh to be merciful must be fulfilled.* But this is scarcely the kind of thought to be expected at the close of such an arraignment of Israel's sins. If Yahweh's unchangeable purpose to be merciful has protected them from his righteous wrath thus far, why should it not continue to do so indefinitely? The second view yields the sense, "You, O sons of Jacob, cease not to depart from evil." † But this calls for too much from the imagination of the reader, besides using כלה in an unusual sense. The third interpretation is, "You, O sons of Jacob, have not come to an end," *i. e.* "You are still sons of Jacob, the deceiver and trickster." ‡ This, however, involves making the writer say in very obscure terms what he might easily and safely have said with the greatest plainness. Nothing less than a clear threat of punishment will satisfy this context.

2[17]. הוגעתם] 𝔊 *οἱ παροξύνοντες*. 𝔙 literally, *laborare fecistis*. Siev. om. יהוה and reads, הוֹנַעְתּוּנִי.—בעיני י׳] Marti and Siev. om. as gloss. —ובהם הוא חפץ] 𝔙 freely, *et tales ei placent*. Marti and Siev. om. as gloss. The only considerations in support of the omission of this and the foregoing phrases are (1) the obstacle they present to a poetic structure; (2) the fact that they employ the 3d pers. with reference to Yahweh. But no poetic measure can be legitimately recovered here and interchanges of person in prophetic address are very common.—3[1]. מלאכי] The name given to our prophet in 1[1] was probably borrowed from this verse by an editor who identified the messenger here spoken of with this prophet; *v.* n. on 1[1].—לפני] Eth. לְפָנֶיךָ; so Matt. 11[10].—היכלו הארון] Bu. הֵיכָלִי הַדַּיָּן. This is an attempt to do away with the apparent confusion of "the Lord" with "the messenger of the covenant"; but it fails because the supposititious "judge" could be none other than Yahweh himself; and so the confusion remains.—ומלאך] Sta.[Theol.] I, 133 *f.*, וּמַלְאָךְ. —הברית] Hi. הַבֹּרִית, rendering "angel of purification"; but בֹּרִית never has the abstract meaning "purification," but always the concrete "soap" or "lye," which is ludicrously inept as applied to an "angel."— 2. מכלכל] 𝔙 *poterit cogitare.*—כי הוא] 𝔊 adds *εἰσπορεύεται*; hence Bu. adds יָבוֹא and Riessler בָּא.—מצרף] Riessler, מַצְרֵף = "a furnace"; *cf.* 𝔊 *χωνευτηρίου*; but the parallel "fullers" is in favour of a personal epithet here.—וכבורית] 𝔊 *πόα*; *cf.* 𝔙 *herba*. These renderings point to the

* So Ke., Dr., *et al.*. † Pres., *et al.*. ‡ Or., Kent., *et al.*,

origin of 'ב from certain alkaline plants, the ashes of which are used as soap in the Orient even at the present day. 'ב occurs again only in Je. 2^{22}; it is formed from ברר; *cf.* Assy. *barâru* = "shine."—**3.** וישב] 𝔖 = וְיָשַׁב. The refiner of silver naturally sits at his work, since the perfection of the process is marked by the colour of the molten metal, which he must therefore watch at close range; *cf.* עמד in Mi. 5^{3}.—כסף] Om. as dittog. from below; so We., GASm., Now., Marti, Siev., Isop., Kent. Bu. emends to כַּפָּא or בְּכַפָּא, depending upon ישב. 𝔊 ὡς τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ ὡς τὸ χρυσίον; hence Riessler, כַּכֶּסֶף וְכַזָּהָב. But this is only free expansion.—וְזִקַּק] ἅπ. in Pi'el. *Pathaḥ* instead of *ṣere* between the two identical harsh radicals. 𝔊 χεεῖ. 𝔙 *colabit.* 𝔖 *he will select.*—ליהוה] Bu. לִי; so Now.[K]. Marti, Siev., Kent, om. as gloss.—**4.** ליהוה] Bu. לִי; so Now.[K]; Siev. om. as gloss.—**5.** מכשפים] Hal. מְקַנְּנִים; so Riessler.—מנאפים] Wkl. מנימים = another class of sorcerers; but no such class is known to have existed.—נשבעים] 𝔊 and 8 codd. of de R. with 16 of Kenn. add בִּשְׁמִי.—לשקר] Wkl. om. as gloss.—שְׂכַר] Om. as dittog., with We., Oort, Now., Marti, Bu., Siev., Isop., van H., Du., Kent. 'ש cannot well be the object of עשק, for this verb everywhere else has a personal object. Mi. 2^{2} is no true exception to this usage, for the real objects of עשק there are גבר and איש, בית and נחלתו being of secondary importance and attached to 'ע by zeugma. Riessler tr. and reads שכיר שָׂכָר, which is a good reading, but burdens שכיר with a limitation such as is not found with the parallel objects of 'ע, viz. אלמנה and יתום. Wkl. treats 'ש as dittog. of a corrupt word, the original of which was שָׁבְרוּ, which preceded מטי, corrupted from מַטֵּה.—אלמנה] 𝔊 καὶ τοὺς καταδυναστεύοντας χήραν; hence Riessler, 'וּמוֹנֵי א. 𝔖 = וגר ויתום ואלמנה, thus adding another class.—ויתום] 𝔊 καὶ τοὺς κονδυλίζοντας ὀρφανούς; hence, Riessler, וּמַכֵּי יתום. But such renderings in 𝔊 are free translations, and call for no change of text.—גר] 𝔊 κρίσιν προσηλύτου; hence Bu., Kent, and Riessler, מִשְׁפַּט גר. But גר itself may well be the object of מַטֵּי; *cf.* Am. 5^{12} Is. 10^{2} 29^{21}.—**6.** כי] Now., Siev. om. as a connecting gloss.—יהוה] 𝔗 adds אלהיכם; so also Riessler. That 'י is not the predicate of אני, but in apposition with it as the subj. of שניתי, is shown by the structure of the parallel clause in which אתם and בני יעקב must be taken as appositives.—לא כליתם] Om. לא as dittog. from the preceding or the following לא. The same result would be secured if we could regard לא as an emphatic *la* = "you will *surely* be destroyed"; *cf.* Haupt, in *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung*, for 1907, col. 305 *ff.*, on this use of לא. 𝔊[B a. b] οὐκ ἀπέχεσθε, and joins the first two words of v. [7] with it, rendering them "from the iniquities of your fathers." 𝔊[A] ἀπέσχεσθε. 𝔊[B*] ἀπέεσθε. 𝔖 *you have not refrained from your iniquity;* this addition can hardly be due to 𝔊, for it leaves a part of 𝔊's rendering, viz. "of your fathers," without any connection. It is probably due simply to the effort of 𝔖 to obtain sense here. Or. לא כְלִיתֶם;

so GASm., Bu., van H.. But this requires an object to complete the sense. Riessler, וְלֹא כְלִיתֶם. Hal. לֹא כְלִיתֶם לוֹ, — "you have not languished after him" (*cf.* Dt. 28[32]), borrowing לוֹ from the לְ of v.[7]; but the change of pers. is too violent. Siev. כְּלִי־תֹם, dropping לֹא; so Now.[K] (?) Marti[Kau.] (?); but this is too tame. Marti[Kau.] also suggests dropping לֹא and reading כֻּלְּכֶם; *cf.* Du.[Pro.] לִי כֻלְּכֶם; *i. e.* "but you—sons of Jacob are you all (to me)." In addition to the improbability of confusion between כ and ת, this reading fails to provide a sufficiently strong finish for the sentence.

§ 6. THE PAYMENT OF TITHES WINS THE BLESSING OF GOD (3^{7-12}).

The prophet takes up still another obstacle in the way of the free outpouring of Yahweh's grace toward Israel. Israel has been unwilling to pay the price of his favour. Let the tithes and offerings be brought in to the full and showers of blessings will fall upon the land. The crops will be abundant and the land of Israel will become the envy of all the peoples.

7. *Even from the days of your fathers you have revolted from my statutes and have not kept them*] The period covered by this indictment includes at least the lifetime of the prophet's hearers up to the time of this address. It probably reaches back also into the previous generation and, possibly, even further. For a similar attitude toward the past on the part of other prophets, *v.* Ho. 10^{9} Je. $7^{25\,f.}$ 25^{3-7} Ez. 2^{3} 20^{6-26} Is. 43^{27}. The "statutes" include, in general, everything that has come to be regarded as an expression of the will of Yahweh. In particular, the reference is probably to the provisions of the Deuteronomic Code, under which Israel was living in this prophet's day. One outstanding illustration of the kind of conduct here resented is furnished by the following verse. *Return unto me, that I may return unto you, says Yahweh of hosts*] So also Zc. 1^{3}. Repentance and conversion will forestall the destructive punishment threatened in v.[6]. Yahweh waits to be gracious unto his people; but the exercise of his grace is conditioned upon a proper attitude of mind and heart on the part of the would-be recipients.—*And you say, How shall we return?*] As before, the people are represented as challenging the

prophet to substantiate his charge by citing particulars. The question is not *bonā fidē*, but a virtual declaration of innocence. It calls for facts.—**8.** *Will man rob God?*] To ask the question, in the prophet's mind, is to answer it. A reply in the negative seems to him the only possible one. 𝔊 𝔖 reflect a text which had the verb "cheat" instead of "rob" in all three occurrences within this verse; the difference between the two in Hebrew is very slight. But the statement that follows is much more easy as in 𝔐, since one may in a certain sense "rob" God, as it is there stated Israel has done; but it is not possible to "deceive" or "cheat" him, and our prophet would hardly represent it as possible.—*Yet you are robbing me*] That which one can scarcely conceive as possible of contemplation by men, Israel is actually doing. The foregoing question was set in general terms, viz. "man" and "God"; the accusation is direct and personal in the highest degree, viz. "you" and "me."—*But you say, Wherein have we robbed thee?*] This question demands and receives a specific answer. The prophet does not content himself with hazy and indefinite generalisations.—*In the tithe and the offering*] In the midst of hard times such as those through which the Jewish community was passing, it requires much faith and loyalty to keep up the payment of the regular religious dues. The common experience is that when receipts decrease, or expenses increase with no accompanying increase of income, the first thing to suffer is the cause of religion. Its needs seem more remote and less pressing than the necessities of food, raiment, housing, education, and the like, which are ever with us. This cause, together with a general decline of religious fervour that was directly due to the fact that the community as a whole was unable to see wherein zeal for Yahweh was yielding any returns in terms of prosperity and influence, had brought about a serious diminution in tithes and offerings, which the prophet does not hesitate to brand as robbery. The Deuteronomic law regarding tithes (14^{22-29} 26^{12-15}) provided for an annual tithe "of thy grain, thy new wine and of thine oil," which was to be brought to Jerusalem along with the firstlings of the herd and the flock and to be eaten at the temple by the givers and the Levites. It also

arranged for a triennial tithe, which was to be stored "within thy gates," in order that the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless and the widow might draw subsistence therefrom. Neither of these requirements accords fully with the prophet's charge and demand, since the former contemplates no such storage of the tithe as is implied in v. ^{10}; and the latter calls for the storage of the tithe in the various cities, while v. ^{10} again evidently conceives of it as stored in Jerusalem only. The prophet's presuppositions are best met by the tithing law of the Priestly Code, viz. Lv. $27^{30\,ff.}$ Nu. 18^{21-31}, which requires the whole tithe to be given to the priesthood (viz. the Levites and the priests proper) *i. e.* to Yahweh, and apparently implies that it should all be brought to the temple. This concord between Malachi and P does not necessarily involve dating Malachi after the adoption of the P code in the days of Nehemiah and Ezra. For it is an established fact that the code in question contains many laws and customs which were in force long before the code itself was formulated. Thus, Malachi's demands regarding the tithe may well have been based upon a usage that had grown up in Israel, but had not yet found its place in a formal code of laws. In the days of Nehemiah, the people pledged themselves to pay the tithes exactly as Malachi here presupposes they should (Ne. $10^{38\,ff.}$); but the pledge was quickly forgotten and the tithe allowed to go by default as here (Ne. $13^{10\,ff.}$).—**9.** *With a curse you are accursed*] *i. e.* because of Israel's sins, the land and people lie under the curse of Yahweh which frustrates all their efforts and brings to nought all their hopes; *cf.* 2^2. For other examples of the operation of the curse of Yahweh, *cf.* Hg. $1^{6\,ff.}$ Zc. 5^{1-4} Lv. 26^{14-45} Dt. 28^{15-68}. —*For me you are robbing*] The emphasis is on *me*, the intent being to impress strongly upon those addressed the fact that it is God whom they are robbing and thus arousing to wrath. It is bad to rob men; how much worse to rob God!—*This whole nation*] A phrase pointing out those included in the address. The sins denounced are confined to no one class, but are characteristic of the community as a whole.—**10.** *Bring the whole tithe into the storehouse*] The form of the behest suggests, not that the tithe had been allowed to go wholly by default, but that it had not

been paid in full. This may have been due to the fact that the people as a whole had each kept back part of his tithe, deeming that he needed it worse than the priests did, or to the fact that large numbers of them had ceased tithing altogether, while the faithful pious were denying themselves in order that they might meet their religious obligations in full. For the storehouse in question, *v.* Ne. $10^{38\,f.}$ 12^{44} $13^{5.\,12}$ 2 Ch. $31^{11\,ff.}$.—*That there may be food in my house*] *i. e.* food for the priesthood. The more common meaning of the word rendered "food" is "prey" (*cf.* Am. 3^{4} Gn. 49^{9} Nu. 23^{24}); but the rendering "food" is supported by Jb. 24^{5} Pr. 31^{15} Ps. 111^{5}.—*And test me, I pray, herein, says Yahweh of hosts*] The thought that Yahweh may be subjected to specific tests in order that the truth of his promises may be verified prevailed in Israel from the earliest times till the latest; *cf.* Ju. 6^{36-40} Ex. 4^{1-9} 1 K. $18^{22\,ff.}$ Is. $7^{10\,ff.}$ Je. $28^{16\,ff.}$. That the prophet should condition the bestowal of Yahweh's favour upon the payment of the tithe alone is surprising. To be sure, this act would in itself indicate a change of attitude toward God, without which there could be no manifestation of his favour. Nevertheless, the prophet's conception of the nature of religion is evidently less ethical and spiritual than that of his great predecessors, viz. Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Jeremiah. It is inconceivable that they could have represented Yahweh as contented with the performance of any single act, least of all one in the sphere of ritual. —*Surely I will open for you the sluices of the heavens*] *i. e.* send down abundant rains. This is the apodosis to the protasis implied in the preceding imperatives. For figures representative of exactly the opposite idea, *cf.* Dt. 11^{17} Lv. 26^{19}. The heavens open to rain down destruction in Gn. 7^{11} Is. 24^{18}, but blessings in Dt. 28^{12} and 2 K. $7^{2.\,19}$, in the latter of which passages is the only other occurrence of the figure "sluices" or "windows" in the heavens. Evidently the land has been suffering from drought and consequent failure of crops, as implied in v. ^{11}, which the prophet interprets as due to the curse of Yahweh. Regular tithes each year will bring regular and full crops. The triennial tithe of Deuteronomy hardly satisfies the requirements of this situation.—*And I will pour out for you a blessing until there is no*

more need] There is unlimited abundance of blessings in the storehouse of Yahweh. Israel's failure to receive them is due solely to her failure to deserve them. The last clause of this sentence has been translated and interpreted in a variety of ways, *e. g.* (1) until there are not enough people to eat the abundance; (2) until God has no more abundance left from which to bestow blessings, *i. e.* for ever;* (3) until sufficiency has no place, *i. e.* more than enough;† (4) until there is no more room, *scil.* to contain the blessings;‡ (5) until there is no proportion to your needs, *i. e.* beyond measure.§ These all, however, yield the same general sense and it is that which is clearly demanded by the context.—**11.** *And I will rebuke the devourer for you, so that he will not destroy the fruit of the ground for you*] Locusts are probably meant. They constituted one of the most terrible pests that beset the farmer's crops.** The "for you" is not emphatic either time.—*Nor will the vine in the field cast its grapes for you, says Yahweh of hosts*] *i. e.* by reason of mildew or blasting; *cf.* Jb. 15^{33}. The notable thing about this entire description of the manifestation of Yahweh's favour is the fact that the only blessings mentioned are those of a material character, just as in Am. 9^{11-15}. The ethical note is wholly lacking. The prophet meets the people on their own level. They have lost faith in Yahweh because they do not see the only kind of proof of his power and love that they can appreciate, viz. riches and power for themselves. The prophet, therefore, assures them in Yahweh's name that the only way in which they can obtain these things is by conforming to the requirements of Yahweh in the payment of his dues. This being done, he will abundantly repay them in kind.—**12.** *And all the nations will call you blessed*] Israel will be the envy of all the peoples because of this outpouring of Yahweh's favour. No blessing that failed to set Israel on high among the nations could be considered complete. This is the finishing touch to the picture of happiness.—*For you will be a land of delight, says Yahweh of hosts*] The present lamentable conditions will give place to

* De Dieu, Rosenm., Hesselberg, Ges. (*Thesaurus*, p. 334), BDB., *et al.*.
† Hd., *et al.*. ‡ Ki., Hi., Ew., Reinke, Köh., *et al.*. § Van H..
** *V.* Dr.'s excursus on locusts in his *Joel and Amos*, 82-91.

those that will leave nothing to be desired. Similar idealisations of Israel and Palestine are found in Is. $54^{12f.}$ 62^{4} Ez. $20^{6.15}$ Zc. 7^{14} $8^{12.23}$ Ps. 48^{2} Dn. 8^{9} 11^{16}.

7. למימי] 𝔊 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδικιῶν, connecting it with v.[6]. Hence, Bu. מֵעֲוֺנוֹת, and Riessler לְמוּסָי, both joining it to v.[6]. The use of לְ before מִן, denoting the *terminus a quo* is common; *e. g.* Ju. 19^{30} 2 S. 7^{19} Je. 7^{7} 42^{8} Mi. 7^{12}. The function of לְ is to mark the expression unmistakably as a *terminus*, למן being practically = "back to and from."—אבותיכם] Du.[Pro.] אֲבִיכֶם, *i. e.* Jacob; but this is wholly unnecessary, even though it would furnish a firmer basis for the reading of 𝔊 in v.[6].—שמרתם] Rd. שְׁמַרְתֶּם, with We., Oort, Now., Isop., Du.[Pro.]. 𝔖 = שמעתם; so also Kenn. 93. Marti om. ולא ש' as a gloss. Siev. adds מִשְׁמַרְתִּי, as object of ש', omitting the foll. אמר י' צ'] as a gloss, and treating the whole verse as a later addition.—8. Marti and Now.[K] tr. the first clause to the beginning of v.[9] *mtr. cs.*; but no other consideration favours the change and metre cannot be demonstrated here.—היקבע] 𝔊 μήτι πτερνιεῖ = היעקב; so also We., Now., Marti, Siev., Isop., Du.[Pro.], Riessler. 𝔊 renders the two foll. forms of this verb in the same way, and is followed by the same group of scholars. Aq. Σ Θ, ἀποστερήσει, which is a suitable rendering of either text. 𝔙 *si affiget* supports 𝔐, being based upon a Syr. root קבע. 𝔖 *wrong* or *defraud* = 𝔊. קבע occurs again only in Pr. 22^{23}, where either "rob" or "defraud" suits the context. The meaning "rob" rests upon Jewish tradition. Nothing more specific is known about the root; but the mere fact that the precise meaning of a word is unknown is in itself insufficient reason for changing the text in a literature so limited as the Hebrew. The only known cognates are Assy. *qebû*, "speak"; Syr. קבע, "fasten," or "fix"; Ar. *qaba'a*, "cover," "draw in the head," etc. These yield no aid. Not much stress may be laid on the fact that עקב would furnish a pun on בני יעקב of v.[6]; for close connection between the two verses is broken by v.[7] and, furthermore, Mal. is not characterised by any effort after paronomasia.—המעשר והתרומה] Best treated as depending upon בְּ carried over from the previous question, or as an acc. of specification; *cf.* Pr. 22^{23}. But Marti treats it as an exclamation, viz. "tithe and offering—how about them?"; and Or. takes it as a nominative, viz. "the tithe and offering (*scil.* are your offences against God)." 𝔊 = *because the tithes and offerings are with you;* hence Bu. prefixes כִּי עִמָּכֶם (so also Now.[K] and Marti[Kau.]), and Riessler בָּכֶם.—תרומה] Associated with the tithe also in Dt. 12^{11} Ne. 10^{37} 12^{44}. According to Ez. 44^{30}, every ת' belonged to the priests. A typical ת' is prescribed in Ez. 45^{13-15}. The word denotes, literally, "that which is raised up" (*scil.* from a larger portion). It is then set apart for Yahweh and his priests. Its earliest

use was of the products of the soil as offered to Yahweh. Later, it came to cover almost any kind of materials offered specifically to Yahweh for the use of his priesthood. In Nu. 18^{24}, it designates the tithe itself and in 18^{26-29}, that portion of the tithe which was given to the priests proper. The tithe and ת׳ together constituted a large element in the maintenance of the temple staff of priests and Levites.—**9.** במארה אתם נארים] 𝔊 ἀποβλέποντες ὑμεῖς ἀποβλέπετε, deriving it from ראה. 𝔗 *et dissimulantes vos dissimulastis.* 𝔙 *et in penuria vos maledicti estis.* The Niph. prtc. נֵאָרִים sharpens the first consonant rather than the second; *v.* Ges. $^{§ 67 u}$. —הגוי כלו] 𝔊 τὸ ἔτος συνετελέσθη; so 𝔈, but joining it to v. ^{10}. 𝔊^{N*} ἔθνος. 𝔖 joins with v. ^{10} as a vocative. Schulte, in *Theolog. Quartalschrift* for 1895, p. 228, reads הַיָּמִים כָּלוּ, and joins it with v. ^{10}. Now.^{K} om. as a gloss. Siev. treats the whole verse as a later addition. *Massora magna* notes that כֻּלּוֹ in Je., Ez., and Minor Prophets (aside from this passage and Je. 6^{13}) is always written כֻּלֹּה; whereas, in the remaining books כֻּלּוֹ is found, except in 2 S. 2^{9} Is. 15^{3} 16^{7}.—**10.** הביאו] Riessler, והביאו.—ויהי] Riessler, ויהיה.—טרף] 𝔊 = טַרְפּוֹ.—בביתי] 𝔊^{B} = בְּבֵיתוֹ. 𝔊$^{Nc. a Y}$ HP. 23, 49, 𝔗 𝔖^{H} = בבתיכם.—ובחנוני] 𝔊^{BN*Q} ἐπισκέψασθε. 𝔊$^{Nc.b Y Held.}$ HP. 95, 185, ἐπιστρέψατε, probably an error for ἐπιτρέψατε. Aq. Θ = 𝔐.—אמר י׳ צ׳] Marti, Siev., Now.^{K} om. as gloss.—אם לא] This may be construed as introducing either an indirect question depending upon בחנוני; or a condition with an implied apodosis, making it the strongest form of affirmation; *cf.* Ges. $^{§ 149 b}$. Owing to the interruption wrought by אמר י׳ צ׳, the latter construction is, on the whole, the easier.—ברכה] Riessler, בִּרְכָתִי.—עד בלי די] 𝔊 ἕως τοῦ ἱκανωθῆναι. 𝔙 *usque ad abundantiam.* 𝔖 𝔗 *until you say, It is enough.* 𝔐 literally = "until there is no sufficiency." But "sufficiency" and "need" are closely related ideas, and in such passages as Ob. ^{5} Pr. 25^{16} Na. 2^{13} Lv. 25^{26}, the latter idea seems the nearer to the sense of די. Thus the rendering "until there is no need" is probable here, and it makes no such demands upon the imagination as does any rendering based upon the meaning "sufficiency."—**11.** וגערתי] 𝔊 διαστελῶ = וְגָרַעְתִּי, or וגרעתי.—לכם] *Dat. commodi* and in the two foll. cases, *dat. incommodi.* Marti om. the 2d and 3d as glosses. It is not unlikely that one of them may be due to dittog. or to a glossator.—ישחית] 𝔊 = אַשְׁחִית.—תשכל] שׁ׳ in the Pi'el commonly means "make childless"; it is applied to the products of the soil only here and in 2 K. 2^{19}.—**12.** אתם] Added for emphasis.—Marti om. v. ^{12} as a later addition because of its attitude toward the heathen world. But Mal. contains nothing elsewhere which renders it unlikely that this prophet regarded his own people as favoured above the nations at large in the eyes of Yahweh; *cf.* n. on 1^{11}.

§ 7. THE FINAL TRIUMPH OF THE RIGHTEOUS (3^{13}–4^{6}).

The prophet first sets forth the doubts that have troubled the pious regarding the value of their piety in Yahweh's eyes. The facts of experience seem to tell against the profitableness of godliness (3^{13-15}). He then assures the pious that Yahweh has not forgotten them, but intends to treat them with a father's love in the great day of judgment that is coming. They will then realise fully the distinction that Yahweh makes between the godly and the ungodly (3^{16-18}). For, in that day, the wicked will be wholly consumed, like stubble in the flames, whereas the pious will rejoice exceedingly and will triumph gloriously over their enemies (4^{1-3}). The book closes with a note of warning regarding the Law and an explanatory gloss concerning the day of Yahweh (4^{4-6}).

13. *Your words have been stout against me, says Yahweh*] The address is to Yahweh-worshippers who have begun to lose faith and are in danger of apostacy from Yahweh, as is evident from vv. $^{14f.}$. The verb "be stout" is used, in the intensive form, in the sense "make stubborn" or "obstinate," in Ex. 4^{21} Je. 5^{3}.—*But you say, Wherein have we talked against thee?*] A question not in good faith, but implying denial of the prophet's charge and challenging him to furnish proof; *cf.* $1^{2.6}$ 2^{14} $3^{7.8}$. The form of the verb indicates "talking together"; *i. e.* Yahweh's ways have been the object of criticism in conversational circles. The same usage occurs in v. ^{16} Ez. 33^{30} Ps. 119^{23}.—**14.** *You say, It is useless to serve God, and what profit is it that we have kept his charge and that we have walked in mourning before Yahweh of hosts?*] This same attitude of mind has received direct consideration from our prophet twice before, viz. $1^{2ff.}$ 2^{17}. It was evidently a note characteristic of the thinking of the times. It is the sign of a commercial type of piety. If Yahweh receives the gifts, obedience and worship of his people, it is incumbent upon him to make liberal returns in the form of material prosperity, political influence and supremacy, and the like. If such things are not

forthcoming, why worship him? It is noteworthy that this prophet apparently accepts this standard of value for religion. He makes no attempt to substitute any other; but satisfies himself either with pointing out that Israel has not fulfilled the necessary conditions, having been careless of her obligations toward Yahweh, or with asserting confidently that the time of reward has not yet come, but is due in the immediate future. "His charge" is practically equivalent to "his commands" or "statutes"; it refers to religious duties in general and is not to be identified with any specifically ritualistic obligations; *cf.* Gn. 26^{5} Zc. 3^{7}. Israel claims to have done her best to render Yahweh full obedience and, if at any point there has been a lack, atonement has been made for it by a life of sorrow and penance. "In mourning" probably refers primarily to the outer garb and manner (*cf.* 2 S. 19^{24} Ps. $35^{13\,f.}$ 38^{6} Jb. 30^{28}), but does not exclude a genuine inner grief. In the period to which our prophet belonged, as Wellhausen well says, piety and sorrow were constant companions.—**15.** *And now—we are deeming the arrogant fortunate*] The contrast with what ought to have been is striking; *cf.* v.[12]. The people who have scorned the requirements of Yahweh are prospered; while those who have feared him look upon them with envious eyes. *Cf.* Ps. $73^{3\,ff.}$. The arrogant are not the heathen,* but the godless within Israel herself,† as in Ps. $119^{21.\,51.\,69.\,78.\,85.\,122}$. The heathen would scarcely be spoken of as "testing" God; *cf.* v.[19].—*Yea, the doers of wickedness are built up; yea, they test God and escape*] For the figure of building as representative of the prosperity of persons, *cf.* Je. $12^{16\,ff.}$ 31^{4} Jb. 22^{23}. The "test" here is probably an allusion to the "test" proposed in 3^{10}. According to all accepted standards, the wicked have tried the goodness of God beyond endurance. Yet they do not receive the punishment they so well merit. The pious are suffering oppression and want; the wicked escape all trouble and they prosper on every hand. Is this not "test" enough?

16. *Thus have those who feared Yahweh talked together, each with his fellow*] The prophet now lapses into the third person,

* *Contra* Jer., Calvin, Hi., Reinke, Ke., Isop., *et al.*.

† So *e. g.* Mau., Köh., Or., Now., Marti, Dr..

speaking about the pious, rather than to them. Yet in reality his thought is meant for the encouragement of the doubters to whom he has just been speaking. This rendering, based upon 𝕲 𝕾 𝕿, shows unmistakably that the words of vv. $^{14.15}$ are spoken by those who worship Yahweh. 𝕸, however, reads, "Then spake together those who feared Yahweh, etc." Aside from a grammatical difficulty, this involves assigning the foregoing doubts to the godless in Israel, interpreting "the arrogant" as characterising the heathen, and leaving the words of the pious unrecorded. Furthermore, no definite point of attachment in time can be found for "then."—*And Yahweh has given heed and hearkened*] Nothing has escaped the attention of Yahweh. He is ever mindful of his own.—*And a book of remembrance has been written before him*] A permanent memorandum is thus ever before Yahweh's eyes, so that he can by no possibility forget to take up the case of the pious Jews at the appropriate time. This conception of the deity as provided with books or tablets to aid his memory in preserving the records of human deeds is not uncommon. It is found, for example, in Dn. 7^{10} Ps. 56^{8} 69^{28} 139^{16} Ez. 13^{9} Is. 4^{3} 65^{6} Ex. 32^{32} Ne. 13^{14} Rev. 20^{12}.* The idea was probably based upon the corresponding custom of oriental monarchs; *cf.* Est. $6^{1.2}$; Herodotus' *Hist.* III, 140, V, 11, VIII, 85. An equivalent Greek phrase was "written upon the tablets of Zeus" (ἐγράφη ἐν Διός δέλτοις).—*Regarding those who fear Yahweh and take refuge in his name*] These are they whose names and records appear in Yahweh's book. 𝕸 describes them somewhat differently, by making the latter half of the clause read, "and think of his name." But this creates a difficult and isolated Hebrew idiom and yields a rather weak sense. The emended text describes the pious as solicitous to obey Yahweh perfectly and as placing their whole confidence in him under even the most trying circumstances. To "take refuge in Yahweh's name" is to take refuge in Yahweh himself, for in the Hebrew mind the name and the personality were inextricably intermingled and practically identified.† —**17.** *And they will be mine, says Yahweh of hosts, on the day*

* *V.* also Book of Jubilees 36^{10} 39^{6}; Pirqe Aboth 2^{1}; Enoch 81^{4} 89^{62} $90^{17.20}$ $98^{7\,f.}$. For the same idea in Babylonian literature, *v.* *KAT.*[3], 402.

† *Cf.* Giesebrecht, *Die alttestamentliche Schätzung des Gottesnamens* (1901), *passim.*

which I am about to make] The phrase "be mine" connotes a most intimate relationship, with all the favour and blessing involved in such a relationship. The remainder of the verse, with v. ^{18}, sets forth a part of the significance of the phrase. The day of Yahweh is, of course, before the prophet's mind. 𝔐 contains an additional word, probably a gloss, which makes it necessary to translate, "And they will be my special treasure, says Yahweh of hosts, on the day, etc." But this is difficult Hebrew (*v. i.*).—*And I will spare them even as a man spares his son who serves him*] *i. e.* in the terrible judgment of Yahweh's day, Israel will be pitied and shielded by Yahweh, just as a father shields his own sons and requires hired workmen or slaves to undertake the more difficult, dangerous, or unpleasant tasks. The prophet here sounds again the note upon which he began his prophecy, viz. Yahweh's love for Israel; *cf.* Ps. 103^{13}. This is indeed the underlying thought throughout his whole book.—**18.** *And you shall again distinguish between the righteous and the wicked, between him who serves God and him who serves him not*] *i. e.* just as in the "good old times" prosperity attended Israel and attested her standing as the people of God, so on the day of Yahweh the normal moral order will be reinstated. The pious, God-fearing Israelites, who are here addressed, will receive their just reward; whereas the godless, who are now triumphant, will then be prostrated in humiliation and branded as wicked in the sight of all. There will no longer be any excuse for the pious to harbour any such thoughts about God as are expressed in 2^{17}. For similar distinctions between the fate of the pious and that of the ungodly, *cf.* Is. $65^{13f.}$ Ps. $1^{1.4ff.}$ 7^{9} $11^{6.7}$ Dn. 12^{2} Matt. $25^{32ff.}$. Some prefer to render, "You will return (*i. e.* from your present state of mind) and see, etc." * But the adverbial usage "again" is very common and its adoption here avoids the necessity of leaving so much to the imagination.

4^{1}. With this verse, 𝔊 𝔙 and many Hebrew mss. begin a new chapter or, at least, leave an extended space between 3^{18} and 3^{19}. But the best Hebrew tradition supports the continuation of ch. 3 to the end of the book. Our English translation follows 𝔊 𝔙 in

* So *e. g.* We., Now., Dr., van H..

this respect.—*For, behold, that day will come, burning like an oven*] The representation of Yahweh's judgment upon the wicked as a consuming fire is a common one; *e. g.* Is. $10^{16 ff.}$ 30^{27} Zp. 1^{18} 3^{8} Am. $1^{8 ff.}$ Je. 21^{14} Ez. 21^{1-4}. Whatever may have been the origin of this circle of ideas,* it had become completely at home in prophetic thought by the time of Malachi.—*And all the arrogant and every one that does wickedness will be stubble*] *Cf.* Is. 5^{24} 47^{14} Na. 1^{10} Ob. ^{18} Zc. 12^{6}.—*And the day that is coming, says Yahweh of hosts, will burn them so that it will not leave to them root or branch*] *Cf.* Jb. 18^{16}. The total destruction of the wicked is a favourite theme with the prophets; *e. g.* Am. 9^{10} Is. 10^{1-4} Je. 7^{29-34} 10^{22} Ez. 13^{8-16}. —**2.** *But, for you who fear my name, the sun of righteousness will arise with healing in his wings*] This exact figure is nowhere else employed in the Old Testament; but *cf.* Ps. 84^{11} 139^{9}. It means apparently that the era of prosperity and peace that is due the righteous will be inaugurated on Yahweh's day, and that all the wrongs of the past will be made right for Israel. Like the morning sun dispelling the darkness of night, so will a sudden manifestation of Yahweh's righteousness illumine the gloom of Israel's afflictions. Righteousness is here practically equivalent to vindication and victory, as is so often the case in Is., chs. 40–66; *e. g.* 41^{2} 45^{8} 46^{13} $51^{5. 6. 8}$ 56^{1} 62^{1}. *Cf.* Je. 23^{6} 33^{16}. In connection with "sun of righteousness," it is of interest to note that the Babylonian Shamash, the sun-god, was conceived of as the god of justice. The absolute impartiality of the sun's rays may easily have given rise to the association of justice with the sun. The phrase "sun of righteousness" does not indicate any personal agent, but is rather a figurative representation of righteousness itself (*v. i.*). The phrase "in its wings" at once suggests the winged solar disk of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, and Persia. This representation was doubtless known in Judah at this time, either through borrowing from without or as having been inherited from a remote antiquity in Israel itself as in the rest of the oriental world. Isolated allusions like this suggest how little we really know of the social and æsthetic background of Hebrew literature.—*And you shall go forth and skip like fatted*

* *Cf. ICC.* on Zp., p. 179; Gressmann, *Eschatologie*, 49 *f*.

calves] A figure representative of an exuberance of vitality and joy; *cf.* Je. 50^{11}.—**3.** *And you shall tread down the wicked, for they will be ashes under the soles of your feet*] The triumph of the pious over the wicked is one of the standing features of Hebrew eschatology, though it assumes varying forms; *cf. e. g.* Ps. $149^{7.8}$ Mi. 4^{13} 7^{17} Zp. 2^{9} 3^{8} Ob. $^{17 ff.}$ Am. 9^{12} Is. $11^{13 ff.}$ 66^{24}.—*In the day which I am about to make, says Yahweh of hosts*] *Cf.* v.^{17}.

4. *Remember the law of Moses, my servant*] This verse makes connection with neither the foregoing nor the following context. It is an isolated marginal note from some later legalist, who missed any express mention of the Mosaic law in this connection and proceeded to supply the deficiency. He seeks to call attention to the fact that the triumph described in the preceding verses can be realised only through Israel's strict and loyal adherence to the law of Moses. At the time when this note was added, the tradition of the Mosaic origin of the law was evidently well established, though the development of that law and that tradition may not have been complete. The only other references to Moses by name in the prophets are Is. $63^{11.12}$ Je. 15^{1} Mi. 6^{4} Dn. $9^{11.13}$, the latter verses containing the only other mention of "the law of Moses."—*Which I commanded him in Horeb for all Israel*] The mount of the giving of the law is here named in accord with the tradition of E and D (*cf.* Ex. 3^{1} 17^{6} 33^{6} Dt. 1^{2} 4^{10} 18^{16} etc.), rather than Sinai as in J (Ex. 19^{20}) and P (Ex. $19^{1.2}$ Nu. 1^{1}). Perhaps, this verse was added before the P tradition and point of view had reached its full development in the Hexateuch. The terminology of the verse is Deuteronomic, *e. g.* "Horeb," "statutes and judgments"; hence some would deny to the author of Malachi any knowledge of the code of P.* But this addition to Malachi is certainly later than the earlier stages of P. The Deuteronomic standpoint and phraseology were not suddenly eliminated upon the appearance of P.†—*Statutes and ordinances*] These make up the body of the law. The exact difference between "statutes" and "ordinances" is not clear, though the latter seem to have been laws that arose as the result of judicial decisions.

* So *e. g.* We., Now., van H.

† *Cf.* Marti.

5. *Behold, I will send unto you Elijah, the prophet, before the coming of the great and terrible day of Yahweh*] *Cf.* Jo. 2^{31}. Vv. ^{5} and ^{6} seem to be a gloss upon vv. $^{1-3}$. They reopen a subject that was closed with v. ^{3}. Moreover, they apparently take a different view of the day from that presented in vv. $^{1-3}$. There, no work of preparation seems to have been contemplated. The conditions on earth are well defined. Society falls into two classes the godly and the ungodly. All that is needed is the overthrow of the latter and the exaltation of the former. Here, all classes seem to be regarded as deserving of destruction. There are no hard and fast, sharply defined moral and spiritual lines between classes. A preliminary work of purification is needed in order to avert a total destruction on Yahweh's day. These verses probably reflect the conditions of a later age when Hellenising influences had wrought profound changes throughout all Israel. Why Elijah was chosen as the forerunner of the day of Yahweh does not appear. It may well be that the tradition that Elijah escaped death by being carried bodily to the heavens contributed much to the choice. This is the first known reference to him in that capacity; but he remained a permanent figure in later eschatology; *cf.* Enoch 90^{31} (*cf.* 89^{52}), Matt. 11^{14} 16^{14} $17^{10f.}$ Mark 6^{15} 8^{28} 9^{11} Luke 1^{17} $9^{18f.}$ John 1^{21}.* Earlier hints of the expectation of some such forerunner are offered by Dt. $18^{15ff.}$ and Is. 40^{3}. Interpreters here have differed as to whether Elijah was expected to return in person, or another was to come in the spirit and power of Elijah, or the prophetic order in general was to be restored, or the coming of John the Baptist was specifically foretold. Those who see here a prediction of the coming of another than Elijah himself remind us that the expected Messiah is in like manner named David, although there is no thought of the return of the original David; *e. g.* Ho. 3^{5} Je. 30^{9} Ez. $34^{23f.}$ $37^{24f.}$. The circumstances of the two cases, however, are not alike. David did not ascend to heaven and escape death on the one hand; and, on the other, there is no strong tradition of the perpetuation of Elijah's house as is the case with David, whose descendant the Messiah is to be. There is no warrant here for going beyond

* For Jewish tradition regarding the coming of Elijah, *cf.* Schürer, *Jew. Hist.*, § 29, III, 2.

what is written and refusing to accept the language at its face value.—**6.** *And he will turn the hearts of fathers toward their sons and the hearts of sons toward their fathers*] This state of estrangement within families is the mark of a period of rapid transition in thought and customs. Apparently, the younger generation has taken up with some new philosophy or cult or political course and irreconcilable conflict has arisen between them and their elders. This condition best accords with the situation in Israel after the incoming of Greek thought and influence. A similar state of society is reflected in Nu. 7^{1-6}. It is possible to render the preposition "toward" here by "with" and to interpret to the effect that fathers and sons together will be urged by Elijah to repent.* But this yields an intolerable tautology within the sentence and adds no element of strength to the thought.—*Lest I come and smite the land with a ban*] The ban involved the total destruction of those upon whom it fell; *cf.* 1 S. $15^{3\,ff.}$ Jos. 6^{17} 7^{1}. The land referred to is probably Judah and not the earth as a whole. For the opposite of this threat, *cf.* Zc. 14^{11}.

At the end of Mal., the Massora says that in the case of the books of Is., Twelve Prophets, La. and Ec., the next to the last verse of each is to be repeated after the last verse when these books are read in the synagogue, because the last verse sounds too harsh. 𝔊^{ABQΓ} 𝔄 seek to accomplish the same end in Mal. by transposing v. ^{23} (4^{4}) to foll. v. ^{24}. But 𝔊$^{Nc.\ bY}$ 𝔖^{H} foll. the order of 𝔐. For the part played in the arrangement of OT. by this unwillingness to end a book or a passage with a harsh saying, *cf.* Grimm, *Liturgical Appendixes, etc.*.

3^{14}. חזקו] 𝔊 *ἐβαρύνατε*, with דבריכם as obj.; hence Riessler, חֲזִקֹתֶם. Siev. and Now.^{K} om. *mtr. cs.*.—יהוה] 𝔊^{Y} adds *παντοκράτωρ*; so 𝔏.—**14.** עָבֹר] 𝔊 𝔙 = עֹבֵר. 𝔖 *have we feared.*—בֶּצַע] Ordinarily = "gain made by plunder or extortion," and so "unjust gain." But here rather "gain to ourselves," as in Gn. 37^{26} Jb. 22^{3} Ps. 30^{10}.—משמרתו] Riessler, מִשְׁמְרוֹתָיו.—קדרנית] *ἅπ.*. 𝔊 *ἱκέται*. 𝔙 *tristes*. קדר = "be black, dark"; *cf.* Ar. *qadira* = "be dirty." On formation, *cf.* אֲחֹרַנִּית, and Ges. § 100 g.—מפני י' צ'] Marti, מפניו, omitting י' צ'; so Now.^{K}(?), Riessler. Eth. om. צ'; so Siev..—**15.** אנחנו מאשרים זרים] 𝔊 *ἡμεῖς μακαρίζομεν ἀλλοτρίους*, having זרים as in Kenn. 180, 92(?). Siev., Now.^{K}(?) om. א' and point מְאֻשָּׁרִים. Hal. ז' אֲמַרְנוּ מְאֻשָּׁרִים.—נבנו] Hal. נָכֹנוּ.—עשי] 𝔊 = כל עשי; so Riessler.—בחנו] 𝔊 *ἀντέστησαν*.—**16.** אז] Rd. זֶה, with 𝔊 *ταῦτα* and

* So *e. g.* Ki., Rosenm..

𝔖 𝔗; so We., GASm., Oort, Now., van H.. The same confusion occurs in Gn. 4²³, where 𝔐 has אז, while 𝔊 𝔙 represent זה. Bu. כֹּה or וָאֹת; so Now.[K], Marti[Kau.]. Riessler, זאת. Hal. אֵלֶּה. These, however, are too unlike 𝔐 to win general approval. On the force of the pf. with אז as in 𝔐, *v.* Ges. § 107c.—נדברו יר׳ י׳] Bu. וְדִבְּרָהֶם omitting, יר׳ י׳.—ויכתב] 𝔊 ἔγραψεν = וַיִּכְתֹּב; so 𝔖 and Now..—ספר] Now. בְּסֵפֶר.—ליראי י׳] 𝔖 = ליראיו; so Siev., Now.[K].—ולחשבי שמו] Rd. וּלְחֹסֵי בְּשְׁמוֹ, as suggested by Nestle (*ZAW*. XXVI, 290) on the basis of 𝔊's καὶ εὐλαβουμένοις; so also Margolis (*ZAW*. XXVII, 233, 266) and Marti[Kau.]. 𝔊 uses εὐλαβεῖσθαι to render חסה also in Pr. 24²⁸ Na. 1⁷ Zp. 3¹²; *cf.* Margolis, *l. c.*. 𝔖 *those praising* = וּלְשֹׁבְחֵי. We.(?) אחבי. Bu. וּלְחֹכֵי; so Now.[K](?). Hal. חֹשְׁקֵי. 𝔐 is difficult, since חשב does not ordinarily mean "hold dear" or "esteem," but "think" or "plan." In the only places where it approximates the meaning desired here, viz. Is. 13¹⁷ 33⁸ 53³, it is used without a preposition, whereas here it is foll. by בְּ.—17. ליום] Nestle (*ZAW*. XXII, 305), לְיֹם. For לְ, of time when, *cf.* Gn. 8¹¹ 17²¹ 18¹⁴ 21² Is. 10³.—אשר אני עשה] אשר may be taken as a relative particle representing the object of עשה, viz. "the day which I am about to make." For this use of ע׳ in the sense "fix" or "appoint" (*scil.* a day for a special purpose), *cf.* Ps. 118²⁴. Or אשר may be treated as introducing a temporal clause, viz. "when I am about to act." For ע׳ thus used, viz. in an absolute sense, *cf.* v. ²¹ Is. 44²³ 48¹¹ Je. 14⁷ Ps. 22³² 37⁵ Ez. 20⁹· ¹⁴· ²².—סגלה] 𝔊 εἰς περιποίησιν. Aq. περιούσιον. 𝔗 *in possessione.* 𝔙 *in peculium.* 𝔖 *an assembly.* ס׳ = "a special treasure," and it is applied to Israel six times (*e. g.* Ex. 19⁵) and to gold and silver twice (viz. Ec. 2⁸ 1 Ch. 29³). It is best treated here as a gloss on היו לי; so Siev., Now.[K]. Its distance from היו לי, with which it must be taken, is abnormal; *cf.* Nestle, *ZAW*. XXII, 305. Furthermore, we should expect לִסְגֻלָּה. Some would connect it with עשה, rendering "day which I will make my own special treasure"; so *e. g.* Ra., Rosenm.. But עשה ס׳, as Isop. notes, would naturally mean "acquire property"; *cf.* Gn. 12⁵ 31¹ Dt. 8¹⁷ᶠ· Is. 19¹⁰.—העבר] Hal. הָאֹהֵב.—18. וראיתם בין] *Cf.* ידע בין, in 2 S. 19³⁶. The original substantive character of בין shines through such usage.. *Cf.* 𝔙 *quid sit inter;* 𝔗 *quantum sit inter.* Siev. and Now.[K](?) om. בין צ׳ לר׳ *mtr. cs.*.—19. כתנור] 𝔊 adds καὶ φλέξει αὐτούς, which is lacking in HP. 62, 86 and 𝔗, and is under obelus in 𝔖[H]. 𝔖 adds *my wrath.*—וריב] 𝔊 ἀλλογενεῖς = זרים.—עשה] 𝔊, with several codd. of Kenn. = עֹשֵׂי; so Isop.. But כל עשה is a collective expression and may well be continued by a pl., as in אֹתָם.—יעזב] 𝔊 ὑπολειφθῇ = יֵעָזֵב; so We., Now., Marti, Bu., Siev., van H., Du.[Pro.], Riessler. But the 3d pers. sg. active is often used as equivalent to a pass., like the French "on dit," etc..—שרש וענף] 𝔗 freely בר ובר בר: *cf.* its similar treatment of ער וענה in 2¹².—20. שמש] Usually masc., but

fem. here and in Gn. 15[17] Je. 15[9] Na. 3[17] Is. 45[9], as in Ar.. The choice of the fem. here may be due to the influence of the genitive 'צ.—צדקה] Epexegetical genitive; *cf.* Ges. § 128 p.—בכנפיה] 𝔖 *upon his tongue.* 𝔙 *in pennis ejus.* Riessler, בִּכְנָפַיִם, which he renders "in parentheses" and regards as a note indicating that מרפא is a gloss.—וּפִשְׁתֶּם] 𝔊 *καὶ σκιρτήσετε.* Grätz, וּפְסַחְתֶּם. Hal. וְשַׁשְׁתֶּם. The "i" of 'פ is probably due to attenuation from the usual ā; for other cases, *cf.* Ges. § 44 d.—מרבק] 𝔊 *ἐκ δεσμῶν ἀνειμένα.* 𝔙 *de armento.* 𝔖 *of the ox* = מבקר. 'מ is always associated with עגל, viz. Am. 6[4] 1 S. 28[24] Je. 46[21]. It denotes the stall in which cattle were tied for feeding purposes. 'ע' מרבק thus = "well fed, or fattened cattle."—**21.** ועסותם] ἅπ.; *cf.* עָסִיס = "wine newly trodden out." 'ע = "to trample upon," as also in Ar..—כפות] 𝔊 om.; so Bu. as dittog. of תחת.

Vv. [22-24] (Eng. 4[4-6]) are a later appendage to this section; so Böh., *ZAW.* VII, 210 *ff.*; Schwally, *Leben nach dem Tode*, 117; Torrey, *JBL.* XVII, 7; Marti; Siev.; Bu.[Gesch. 178]; Sta.[Theol. I, 235]; Du.[Pro.]; Kö. *Gesch. d. alttestamentlichen Religion* (1912), 414 *f.*. Now. would retain only v. [22] as genuine. The linguistic usage of these verses is not conclusive in itself, but it adds weight to the general considerations urged above in support of their late origin. Mal.'s term is not יום י', nor יום הגדול והנורא, but היום הַבָּא or היום אשר א' ע'. Mal. speaks of התורה, but not of תורת משה. Mal. constantly cites אמר י'; these verses never. אנכי stands here as against אני elsewhere in Mal..—זכרו] Massora writes here ז majuscula, not to emphasise the importance of the maxim, but to note the fact that this is the only place in the Book of the Twelve where this pointing of these consonants is found (Ho. 12[6] 14[8] = זִכְרוֹ); while outside of the Book of the Twelve, with the exception of Jb. 18[17] (= זִכְרוֹ), זֵכֶר is the only pointing of this group that occurs. Von Gall, *ZAW.* XXXI (1911), 75, suggests that the large ז here marks the beginning of an addition, as the beginnings of books are so marked in certain cases, viz. Gn. 1[1] Pr. 1[1] Ct. 1[1] Ec. 1[1] 1 Ch. 1[1]; *cf.* Is. 40[1]. 𝔊[B] *μνήσθητι* = זְכֹר. 𝔄, Eth. and Arm. = 𝔐.—**23.** הנביא] 𝔊 = הַתִּשְׁבִּי (*cf.* BS. 48[10]); so Riessler.—הנורא] 𝔊 *ἐπιφανῆ*, deriving it from ראה.—**24.** אבות] 𝔊 = אב. Riessler, לְבוֹת אבְרוֹת.—על-בנים] על = אֶל, as frequently in later Heb.. Rd. בְּנֵיהֶם, with Bu., Now.[K](?) Marti[Kau.]. 𝔊 = בן.—בנים על אבותם] 𝔊 *ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ*, a free rendering. But Riessler would restore after 𝔊, וְלִבּוֹת נְשָׂאוֹת עַל-רֵעָיו.

INDEXES TO MALACHI.

I. INDEX OF HEBREW WORDS

II. INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON JONAH

BY

JULIUS A. BEWER, PH.D.
ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIBLICAL PHILOLOGY, UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK

INTRODUCTION TO JONAH.

§ 1. THE CHARACTER OF THE STORY OF JONAH.

The story of the wilful prophet is one of the best known and most misunderstood in the Old Testament: an occasion for jest to the mocker, a cause of bewilderment to the literalist believer but a reason for joy to the critic. The Old Testament reaches here one of its highest points, for the doctrine of God receives in it one of its clearest and most beautiful expressions and the spirit of prophetic religion is revealed at its truest and best. It is sad that men have so often missed the spirit by fastening their attention on the form of the story. The form is indeed fantastic enough and, unless rightly understood, it is likely to create difficulties.

At almost every step the reader who takes the story as a record of actual happenings must ask questions. How was it possible that a true prophet should disobey a direct divine command? Is it likely that God should send a storm simply in order to pursue a single person and thus cause many others to suffer too? Do such things happen in a world like ours? Is it not curious that the lot should fall upon Jonah at once, and evidently without manipulation on the part of the sailors, and that the sea should become calm directly after he had been thrown overboard? That the great fish was at once ready to swallow Jonah may be passed, but that Jonah should have remained in the fish for three days and three nights and should have prayed a beautiful psalm of thanksgiving inside, exceeds the limits of credibility, not to mention the point that the fish did not simply eject him but threw him up on the shore. What an exaggerated idea of the greatness of Nineveh the author had! What language did Jonah speak in Nineveh? How could the people understand him? And what a wonderful result followed his preaching! The greatest prophets in Israel had not been able to accomplish anything like it. It is so un-

precedented that Jesus regarded it as the most astounding wonder of the story (Lk. 11[29]). Is it not strange that absolutely no trace has been left of the universal, whole-hearted repentance of the Ninevites and that the later prophets who prophesied against Assyria knew nothing of it? And what shall we say of the extraordinarily speedy growth of the plant?

It is all passing strange. We are in wonderland! Surely this is not the record of actual historical events nor was it ever intended as such. It is a sin against the author to treat as literal prose what he intended as poetry. This story is poetry not prose. It is a prose poem not history. That is the reason why it is so vague at many points where it should have been precise, if it had been intended as a historical record. The author is not interested in things which a historian would not have omitted. So he says nothing about the place where Jonah was ejected or about his journey to Nineveh. He gives no name of the king, but he calls him simply "King of Nineveh," a designation which was never used as long as the Assyrian empire stood. He does not speak of the time of his reign or of the later fate of Nineveh nor does he specify the sins which were responsible for Jonah's mission. He is so little interested in the personal history of Jonah that he does not tell us what became of him after he had received his well-merited rebuke. As soon as he has finished his story and driven home the truth he intended to teach he stops, for he is interested only in that. His story is thus a story with a moral, a parable, a prose poem like the story of the Good Samaritan, or Lessing's Ring story in *Nathan the Wise*, or Oscar Wilde's poem in prose, *The Teacher of Truth*. The very style of it with its repetition and stereotyped forms of speech shows its character, for these stylistic characteristics are not due to the author's limited store of phrases but to his intention of giving a uniform character to the story.

All its strangeness disappears as soon as we put the story into the category in which it belongs. Then we can give ourselves to the enjoyment of its beauty and submit to its teaching of a truth which is as vital and as much needed to-day as it was when it was first told.

It is useless to collect similar instances to prove the possibility of the swallowing of Jonah by the huge fish. Nobody denies that a shark or a sperm-whale can swallow a man whole and alive. But none of the stories usually adduced prove that a man can live three days and three nights in the stomach of a large fish, even if the stories could be relied on as truthful. An illustration of what happens when the facts of such a story are really investigated is given by Luke A. Williams in the *Expos. T.*, XVIII, Feb., 1907, p. 239, where he proves by documentary evidence that König's story of the whale-hunter James Bartley who had been swallowed by a whale and taken out of its stomach alive on the following day (König, *DB.*, II, p. 750 b., *Expos. T.*, XVII, Aug., 1906, pp. 521 *f.*) is nothing but a sea yarn. A similar story adduced by v. Orelli would, I doubt not, have the same fate, if it were investigated.

Another more interesting and at first sight more promising attempt to make the historicity of the miracle probable was made by Trumbull. He contended that it was most reasonable that Jonah should have been swallowed and later ejected by a fish in order that the Ninevites might regard him as an incarnation of their god Dagan, called Oannes by Berosus, who is represented on the monuments as a fish-man, and that they might believe his word more readily and repent. (Ferd. Chr. Baur, in 1837, had already connected Jonah with Oannes, but in a different manner.)

Trumbull has to assume that there were witnesses who saw how Jonah came out of the fish, "say on the coast of Phœnicia, where the fish-god was a favourite object of worship," and that "a multitude would be ready to follow the seemingly new avatar of the fish-god, proclaiming the story of his uprising from the sea, as he went on his mission to the city where the fish-god had its very centre of worship."

But these assumptions have not only no basis in the narrative, but are opposed to its spirit. Nothing is farther removed from the mind of the author than to say that Jonah, the prophet of Yahweh, who had proclaimed to the sailors that *Yahweh was the God of heaven who had made the sea and the dry land*, and who had been sent by Yahweh to proclaim Yahweh's message, should have made upon the Ninevites the impression of being an incarnation of their fish-god, and that Yahweh should have desired "to impress upon all the people of Nineveh the authenticity of a message from himself" in this manner. Doubtless the Ninevites would have thought that the message Jonah was giving was from Dagan and not from Yahweh. It is most improbable that a Jewish author should have thought that Yahweh would accommodate himself so much to the capacity of these heathen as to minister to their superstitions and to strengthen their faith in another god (*cf.* König, *DB.*, II, 752).

§ 2. ORIGIN AND PURPOSE OF THE STORY.

We saw that as soon as we put the story into the category in which it belongs all strangeness disappears. This holds good especially in regard to the fish episode. It has been regarded by most as a singular, unparalleled adventure, and the mythical stories which were told by the Greeks concerning Hercules and Hesione, Perseus and Andromeda, Arion or Jason have usually not been considered by most critics as sufficiently parallel to be connected with Jonah. But the situation is different now. This part of the story, far from being unique and unparalleled, turns out to be a common story the world over. Frobenius especially, and after him H. Schmidt, have shown that a narrative according to which a man was swallowed by a monster, remained a long time inside of it and came out later safe and sound, was told among many peoples. Maritime peoples naturally spoke of a large fish or another sea-monster, inland peoples of a wolf or bear or dragon or some other animal. The mode of deliverance varied, though sometimes it was the same as in the story of Jonah., The essential point, however, is the same with all. Our story of Jonah is therefore but one of a large number, which Frobenius calls "Jonah-stories." *

Such tales of miraculous deliverances must have been told along the coast of Palestine. It is not without significance that the story of Perseus and Andromeda is localised at Joppa, the port at which Jonah embarked. And our author took this rather common feature of the swallowing of a man by a fish and his subsequent deliverance, and used it in his own manner. But his story is altogether different from those others. They are mostly mythical stories about the sun, his is a prophetic story, pervaded by the truest spirit of Israel's religion. To our author the mythical element has entirely disappeared. He uses the fish episode merely in order to bring Jonah back to the land. If he had not known any of those stories, he might perhaps have thought of a different

* Such stories, not the special Jonah-story of the OT., were caricatured by Lucian of Samosata in his *Vera Historia* (Engl. transl. by H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler, *The Works of Lucian of Samosata*, II, pp. 136–173).

means of delivering Jonah. But this feature lay ready at hand and was most impressive, and there was no reason why he should not use it.

The ancient Jews, just as other oriental peoples, loved romance. And a story effectively told would carry home its own lesson where a simple straightforward address would have been useless. Our author knew this well. Other prophets had told parables and had gained a hearing when otherwise it would have been impossible. The great teachers of postexilic Judaism made frequent use of stories as a means of teaching, compare only the stirring tales in Daniel, to mention no others. Our author had a great lesson to teach, a lesson which must not fall on deaf ears. And the situation that confronted him was this. The great prophets had taught that Yahweh is not only Israel's God but the God of the whole world, for He is the only God that exists. From this followed that He is interested not only in Israel but in all the nations of the world, and that His love goes out to them all. He punishes sin wherever He finds it, among the nations as well as in Israel. But He does not desire the death of the sinner but that he repent and live. And so He warns them all of the inevitable punishment that must come, if they continue in sin, and He hopes that they will turn in true repentance and be saved. See Je. 18^{7-9}. This truth is a universal truth, it is for the nations as well as for Israel. It was a wonderful prophetic conception and a glorious doctrine! But it did not control the thoughts and the lives of the Jews. They had become narrow and embittered. The great world powers had dealt cruelly with them, and they had come to feel that the nations deserved nothing but swift and terrible punishment. But the punishment was delayed, and the passion in those hot Jewish hearts grew stronger and the hatred of the heathen fiercer. They hoped for Yahweh's interference on their behalf. Surely Yahweh, the God of righteousness, would vindicate Himself. But they hoped in vain.—Meanwhile the spirit of the great prophets was working gently in some hearts, softening and illuminating them; and the wonderful passion of Deutero-Isaiah with his glorious idea of Yahweh as the one and only God and his ardent hope of the triumph of His religion all over the wide world

and of the salvation of all, was living on in a few great souls. And with it the ideal of Israel's mediatory service for mankind in bringing the knowledge of the true religion to the ends of the earth. An ideal like this, once given, could not die. It lived on in the heart of our author, who felt keenly how far removed Israel was from this ideal. To summon them to it would be worthy the task of a prophet. And so, seeing the great vision of the oneness of God and of His character, and conceiving the universal implications of those truths, he went to his people and told them this story, in the light of which the problem of the delay of the punishment of the nations was solved and by which the heart of Israel was summoned to its high task.

He used folk-loristic elements for his story, as we saw above, but why he should have taken Jonah as the hero of his story is difficult to tell. There had been a prophet Jonah of Gath-Hepher in Zebulon, identified most probably with Meshed in Galilee, three miles north-east from Nazareth. He had predicted victory to Jeroboam II in the ninth century B.C. according to 2 K. 14^{25}. Nothing else is known of him. Neither the Book of Kings nor the Chronicles tell anything else about him. It seems that his name attracted our author as especially appropriate for his purpose, for Jonah = Dove had become a symbolic name for Israel.* Our author needed a representative name and "Jonah" suited his purpose. The Book of Kings does not mention his father's name, and it seems to me most plausible that our author added it himself to express that Jonah (Israel) was the son of Amittai (or probably of *Emeth*) the son of truth, having the truth of God, the true religion,—which indeed Israel did have, but which it did not wish to share with others.—Since this Jonah lived at the time of the Assyrian empire our author chose Nineveh as the representative of the nations, although in his own time Nineveh was no longer in existence. That he antedated Israel's connection with Nineveh is a minor point, since he wrote no historical treatise.

It has sometimes been assumed even by scholars who do not

* Ephraim is compared to a dove by Ho. 7^{11} 11^{11}, and is called a turtle-dove in Ps. 74^{19}. "In later times Jonah or 'Dove' became a standing title for Israel." Che., *EB.*, II, 2567, n. 4, with references.

take the story as a record of literal facts that traditions concerning Jonah had been handed down, *e. g.*, of a trip abroad attended by great dangers, or even of a mission to Nineveh and of his wonderful success there. In the light of the silence of the Books of Kings and of Chronicles, this is most unlikely and, besides, it is altogether unnecessary, because the story is the work of poetic imagination, pure and simple.

Bu. has made a most interesting suggestion in this connection. He regards the Book of Jonah (except the psalm) as a part of the *Midrash of the Book of Kings* to which the Chronicler refers as his source (II, 24^{27}). A Midrash is "an imaginative development of a thought or theme suggested by Scripture, especially a didactive or homiletic exposition, or an edifying religious story" (Driver, *Intr.*, p. 529). Bu. believes that the Book of Jonah is a Midrash on 2 K. 14^{25} and that its place in the midrashic work was after 2 K. 14^{27}, the words of the canonical Book of Kings being, of course, included in it. Yahweh's grace to Israel taught there, is extended here also to the nations. The beginning, ***and it came to pass***, and the abrupt ending of the story point according to him to its having once been part of a larger whole.

That the book has the character of a Midrash Bu. has rightly seen, but that it was part of the Midrash of the Book of Kings has been contested in view of the character of the Midrashim given by the Chronicler and in view of the poor connection between 2 K. 14^{27} and Jon. 1^{1}.

Winckler suggested therefore that it was taken from the *Book of the Seers* (quoted in 2 Ch. 33^{19} 𝔊) which was a Midrash on an old prophetic code and which contained originally also the Books of Isaiah to Malachi. The original place of the Book of Jonah was not after 2 K. 14^{27}, for the mention of Nineveh would be premature there. And really the Jonah of 2 K. 14^{25}, Wkl. argues, is not the same as the Jonah of Jon. 1^{1}, their identification is due to a glossator. The Book of Jonah belongs, not under Jeroboam II but under Manasse with the Book of Nahum, which Wkl. dates from this time. "There the downfall of Nineveh had been predicted, but directly after it had to be told that Manasse had been obliged to go to Babylon to the King of Assyria to justify himself, or at least that he had remained Assyrian vassal. This harmonised but ill with the predictions of Nahum—and thus a commentator felt the need of explaining the matter—and the Book of Jonah was there" (pp. 262 *f.*). It cannot be claimed that Wkl.'s theory is preferable to Bu.'s. It does not do justice to the spirit of the story and its argument against the originality of the identification of our Jonah with the one of 2 K. 14^{25} is untenable (see on 1^{1}). And even if the mention of Nineveh under Jeroboam II were premature (but see Gn.

10^{13} J) we should have to credit the author with this historical error. According to Bu. (*JE.*, VII, p. 226), "Winckler retracted his opinion in '*Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*,' 1903, p. 1224."

The Allegorical or Symbolical Interpretation:—Some scholars, among them Bloch, Kleinert, Cheyne, G. A. Smith, regard the story as an allegory not as a parable. To them it is an allegory of Israel's history. Israel (= Jonah), as God's servant and prophet, was to bring His truth to the nations. But it evaded its duty and was in consequence "swallowed up" by the world power Babylon (= the great fish). In the Babylonian exile it turned and prayed to Yahweh and was disgorged or liberated. After the restoration it was dissatisfied with Yahweh's long-suffering with the nations and waited for their punishment.

The combination of the Babylonian empire with the great fish seems to be fortified by Je. $51^{34.\ 44}$. But there it is a comparison which is made in the text, while in Jonah nothing calls for an allegorical interpretation of the fish. The untenableness of the theory is at once manifest when it is carried through consistently, as, *e. g.*, by Wright, who thinks that the wonderful plant symbolises Zerubbabel. But even the moderate interpretation of G. A. Smith does not sound natural. The heathen powers are represented by the sea, by the fish, and by Nineveh. Cheyne confines himself to the salient points and thus gives the theory its most plausible and attractive character. The elements of truth contained in it have been recognised and done justice to above, but the symbolic interpretation of the fish is uncalled for.

Sometimes, though not usually, the allegorical interpretation is combined with the *typical* which sees in Jonah the type of Christ. This is due to the explanation by the evangelist (Mt. 12^{40})* of *the sign of Jonah* of which Jesus spoke in Mt. 12^{39} 16^{4}. The evangelist interpreted *the sign of Jonah* as meaning the three days and three nights which Jonah spent in the fish and the same period which Jesus was "in the heart of the earth." That Jesus Himself meant by the sign of Jonah something else is plain from Lk. 11^{30}, *For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites* [by his preaching of repentance], *so shall also the Son of man be* [with His gospel] *to this generation.* [32]*The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here.*

Often this reference of Jesus to *the sign of Jonah* has been used as an argument for the historicity of the story of Jonah. Jesus believed in it, so it is reasoned, consequently His followers must do so also. But Jesus had no intention of affirming or denying its historicity. He was using an illustration, and an illustration may be drawn from fiction as well as from actual history. Paul refers to the legend of the rock that followed

* Almost all NT. critics regard Mt. 12^{40} as a gloss or interpretation by the evangelist.

the Israelites on their exodus from Egypt, 1 Cor. 10[4], and Jude refers to the Jewish legend concerning the contention of the archangel Michael with Satan for the body of Moses. Does that stamp these legends as historical facts? We constantly use references to literature as illustrations without thinking for a moment that this implies a belief in the historicity of the stories or persons referred to. Nothing can therefore be inferred in regard to its historicity from the use which Jesus makes of the story. Even v. Orelli who believes in the genuineness of Mt. 12[40] and in the historicity of the Book of Jonah agrees that the historicity of the resurrection does not prove the historicity of the Jonah miracle.*

§ 3. INSERTION OF THE BOOK IN THE PROPHETIC CANON.

When the parabolic character of the Book of Jonah is clearly understood, the surprise that it should have been included among the prophetic books, from which it differs so much in form, disappears, for it is then recognised as belonging there by virtue of its teaching and of its spirit which are those of the greatest prophets. It was therefore a true instinct that led the collectors to place the book in the canon of the prophetic books.

Budde thinks it was included among the Twelve to round out the number twelve. But that seems a most inadequate reason. König suggests that its special place in the canon after Obadiah may be accounted for by the theory that the words *a messenger was sent among the nations* in Ob. 1 "found a clear illustration in the story of Jonah" and "that the question why the threats pronounced against Edom had remained unfulfilled was intended to be answered in the Book of Jonah" (*BD.*, II, 748b).

§ 4. THE DATE OF THE BOOK.

If Jonah himself were the author the date would at once be settled, for Jonah the son of Amittai, of Gath-Hepher in Zebulon, lived under Jeroboam II, to whom he prophesied victory over the Aramæans, 2 K. 14[25]. But the book nowhere claims to have been written by Jonah. It is a story about him not by him. And

* On the use of the fish symbol in the early Christian church, see esp. H. Schmidt, *Jona*, pp. 144 *ff*.

every argument is against so early a date. The language of the book is such that it cannot belong to the ninth century B.C.

A number of late words are used which occur elsewhere only in late literature. Thus מנה 2^{1} $4^{6.\ 7.\ 8}$, a favourite word of our author for the earlier צוה, is found elsewhere only in 1 Ch. 9^{29} Ps. 61^{8} Dn. $1^{5.\ 10.\ 18}$ and frequently in Aramaic, Ezr. 7^{25} Dn. $2^{24.\ 49}$, etc. רִבּו 4^{11} is used in late literature, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Daniel, for the earlier רבבה. In Ho. 8^{12} רִבּו was already suspected by the Masorites who read רֻבֵּי instead of it. שתק occurs elsewhere only Ps. 107^{30} Pr. 26^{20}, and חשב ל (= μέλλω) 1^{4} and קריאה 3^{2} are not found in the earlier literature. Again, there are some decisive Aramaisms in the book. התעשת 1^{6} for the Heb. חשב, *cf.* Dn. 6^{4}, Elephantine Papyri and the Targums. טעם 3^{7} in the sense of *command*, *edict* occurs elsewhere only in Aram., *cf.* Ezr. 6^{14} Dn. 3^{10}, etc., in Heb. the root means *to taste*, *cf.* 3^{7b}. The use of ש for אשר (in בשלמי 1^{7}, בשלי 1^{12}, שבן 4^{10}) became common in later Heb. under Aram. influence. שֶׁל had been used in early northern Israelitish writings (*cf.* Ju. 5) but elsewhere only in late passages (Psalms, Ecclesiastes). Since the other linguistic evidence points to a late date, the use of ש for אשר becomes also an indication of the period when it was so freely employed. מלח 1^{5}, which is not found before Ezekiel ($27^{9.\ 27.\ 29}$) and ספינה which occurs only here in the OT., have both been regarded as Aramaisms. But ספינה means here evidently *the lower deck*, and is derived from the good Heb. root ספן, and מלח may not have been used accidentally, since the OT. has so few sea-stories.

In accord with the linguistic evidence is the familiarity with OT. writings which our author displays. He knew the story of Elijah's flight to Horeb (1 K. 19), for he modelled ch. 4 on it, *cf.* $4^{2a.\ 8b}$ with 1 K. 19^{4b}. He knew the teaching of Je. 18^{7-12}, of the conditional character of Yahweh's predictions to the nations, and his story is a beautiful illustration of the principle expressed in Je. $18^{7.\ 8}$, *At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it, if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do them.* Cp. also Jon. 3^{8b} with Je. 18^{11} 26^{3}. He also knew Deutero-Isaiah's teaching of monotheism in its universal applications and is intent on inculcating it by his story.

This brings us down to exilic or postexilic times and it is interesting to note that Yahweh is called *God of heaven*, a title which

was prevalent in postexilic but so rare in pre-exilic times, that He is called thus only in one early story, Gn. $24^{3.7}$.* With this late date agrees the manner in which Nineveh is spoken of as a city of the past (3^3) and in which it is described as so fabulously great. Moreover the title "King of Nineveh" (3^6) could not have been given to him as long as the Assyrian empire still existed (Sayce, *Monuments*, p. 487).

Everything points thus to the postexilic period, and the book is quite generally dated thus by scholars. To fix the date more definitely is difficult because the indications are too slight. Still the lower limit can be determined. The book cannot be later than the third century B.C., because Jonah is included among the twelve by Jesus Sirach (49^{10}) and referred to by 3 Mac. 6^8 and Tob. 14^4. The fact that our author quotes the ancient characterisation of Yahweh's nature (Ex. 34^6) in the form which Joel (2^{13b}) uses, adding *and relenting of the evil*, may indicate that this form was prevalent at the time when Joel and the author of Jonah wrote, or that the author of Jonah knew Joel's book. The use of another phrase of Joel (2^{14a}) in 3^{9a} would favour the latter. In that case the book was written between 400 and 200 B.C., and this is as much as we can say.

§ 5. THE UNITY OF THE BOOK.

Though the story makes the impression of literary unity, it is not without certain unevennesses and apparent incongruities which tend to give a semblance of truth to the hypothesis of composite authorship which has been repeatedly put forward.

J. G. A. Müller, in 1794, seems to have been the first to deny the unity of the book. He believed that the psalm in ch. 2 was composed by Jonah himself, but the story by an exilic author. In 1799 Nachtigal, in his desire to account for the miraculous story of chs. 1, 2, assumed three sources, which are, as he thought, distinguished by differences in language, spirit and manner of presentation. (1) The prayer, composed by the prophet himself

* The phrase יהוה אלהים 4^6 is not to be explained by dependence on Gn. 2 but by conflation of texts. See below.

after his deliverance from mortal danger, 2^{3-10}; (2) the poetical apology of a Jewish sage of the exile directed against particularistic fanatics of his people, chs. 3, 4; (3) a prosaic introduction, 1^{1-16} $2^{1.2.11}$ 3^{1}, written by a scribe of the time of Ezra and Nehemiah to serve as a connection between the first two originally independent pieces. The mention of Tarshish in 4^{2} suggested a trip to Tarshish and the phrase *from the bowels of Sheol*, 2^{3} (Engl. 2^{2}), Jonah's stay in the fish. The untenableness of this theory is at once apparent. But it is noteworthy that the belief that Jonah composed the psalm himself and that the story was a later invention on the basis of the psalm was entertained also by others, *e. g.*, by Bunsen (*Gott in der Geschichte*, I, pp. 349 *ff.*, see Kue.).

These early attempts had no influence on later criticism. And the next one by K. Köhler (*Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*) seems to have remained unnoticed by everybody except Dean Farrar, who mentions his theory in *The Minor Prophets*, p. 236, according to which Köhler regarded 1^{8} 2^{1-9} (Heb. $^{2-10}$) 3^{9} 4^{1-4} as interpolations. Köhler's article is unfortunately inaccessible to me, but he seems to have discerned the difficulties in chs. 3, 4, which later critics also pointed out, and he apparently tried to remove the chronological difficulty of $3^{5\,ff.}$ $4^{1.5}$ by omitting 4^{1-4} as secondary. It is interesting to notice that this drastic excision of 4^{1-4} was accepted later by Kaufmann Kohler and Riessler.

The next suggestion was made by Kleinert in 1868. He accounted for the incongruities in chs. 3, 4 by assuming that there were "obviously in chapters iii and iv two accounts, which state essentially the same thing, the one in laconic touches, the other in more minute detail . . . and which agree verbally and intimately with one another. First account, ch. iii. 1–5, 10; iv. 1–5. Second account, iii. 1–4, 6–10; iv. 1–3, 6–11." This seems to Kleinert so obvious that he gives no argument in support of his theory. But the assumption of the interweaving of two accounts is justified only if there are evidences of real differences. Here where the accounts agree so closely that it is impossible to separate them, the difficulties must be solved in some other way.

In 1879 the Jewish scholar, K. Kohler, subjected the book to the most searching literary criticism it had as yet received and con-

cluded that a number of interpolations, glosses and redactional transpositions were responsible for the book as we now have it.

Kohler regards as postexilic interpolations in the pre-exilic book: $1^{5b.\ 6.\ 8a\beta b}$ (from *what is thy country* on) $^{9b\beta.\ 10.\ 14}$ $2^{2\text{-}10}$ (Engl. $^{1\text{-}9}$) $3^{6.\ 7.\ 8a\alpha}$ (he reads narrative tenses in $^{8a\beta b}$) ^{9}. $4^{1\text{-}4.\ 5b.\ 6a}$ (*to be for a shade over his head;* Kohler reads with 𝔊 *to give him shade*, and omits *from his displeasure*) ^{11b}.—He inserts in 1^{2}, *Yet three* (𝔊) *days more and Nineveh will be overthrown!* from 3^{4}. He substitutes this also in 3^{1b} for *the message which I will speak to thee.* He inserts in 3^{4} *and so he did on the second day and so he did on the third day.*—He emends $4^{7.\ 8}$, "But at the dawn of the morning Yahweh ordered a *hot wind*, and it smote the castor-oil plant and it withered. And as the sun arose, the sun struck Jonah's head and he became faint, etc.*—Kohler transposes 1^{13} after 1^{5}, and 1^{16} after 1^{9}. "The interpolation of vers. 5c and 6 accounts for the removal [from its right place] of the former, and v. 10 presents itself as a *late substitute of a very problematic nature* in place of v. 16."

The elements of truth in the theory will appear as we proceed. W. Böhme followed Kohler in 1887, but evidently knew nothing of his predecessors. He distinguished four sources and glosses besides.

A, the principal, Yahwistic narrator, $1^{1\text{-}5a}$ (with omissions in $^{3.\ 4a}$) $^{7.\ 8a\alpha.\ 9.\ 10a\alpha.\ 11.\ 12a\alpha.\ 13.\ 15}$ $2^{1.\ 11}$ $3^{1\text{-}3a.\ 4b.\ 5}$ (a lacuna due to R exists after 3^{5} in which the sparing of Nineveh was told) $4^{1.\ 5a}$ (contents) ^{6} (except *to deliver him from his displeasure*) $^{7a\alpha b.\ 8b.\ 9.\ 10a}$ (mostly), ^{11a}. B, the Elohistic author, worked over a part of the same material, $3^{3b.\ 4a.\ 6\text{-}10}$ (except some additions) $4^{5b.\ 10a}$ (*and thou didst not cause it to grow*) ^{11b} (except *and much cattle*) and probably some material in the preceding verses also. R, the Elohistic Redactor, worked A and B together into a whole. C, the Yahwistic supplementer, $1^{5b.\ 6.\ 10a\beta b.\ 12a\beta.\ 14.\ 16}$ $2^{2\text{-}10}$ $4^{2.\ 3}$. To these four Böhme adds the author or authors of minor glosses, 1^{3} (the first *Tarshish*, and the second *from the presence of Yahweh*) $^{4a\beta.\ 5b.\ 6.\ 9a\beta.\ b\beta}$ (*what is thy country*, etc.) 2^{4a} (*into the midst of the sea*) $^{6.\ 7.\ 8}$ (*into Thy holy temple*) ^{9} $3^{7a\beta b}$ (*the cattle and the sheep*, and *shall not feed*) ^{8} (*man and beast*) $4^{4.\ 6a}$ (*to deliver him from his displeasure*) $^{8a.\ 10b.\ 11b}$ (*and much cattle*).

Böhme's theory is so complicated and artificial that it appears at once as most improbable. He magnifies little unevennesses, and requires a logical exactness which is out of the question in a

* תולעת due to a copyist's change of בעלות, acc. to Kohler.

story like that of Jonah. The linguistic differences with which he seeks to strengthen his thesis are imaginary; the difference especially in the use of *Yahweh* and *Elohim* cannot be explained on his hypothesis.—Yet Böhme's perception of the uneven places was so keen, that Kuenen gave it serious consideration. He pointed out, in addition to the above points, that it was highly improbable that a story with such a tendency could have been so popular in postexilic times as Böhme's theory of four writers, besides glossators, assumes. If Böhme had not insisted on parallel narrators in chs. 3, 4 (A and B) and if he had not apportioned the additions to various distinct writers, his criticism would not have looked like "a mere curiosity" (Cornill). For in spite of the untenableness of his theory, his article contained many acute suggestions which later criticism has found valuable, *e. g.*, on 1^{3} 2^{4} 3^{8} 4^{6}; and strange as it may seem it has strongly influenced the recent criticism of H. Schmidt and Riessler.

Winckler (1899) tried to solve the literary problem of the book in a much simpler manner. He transposed 1^{13} after 1^{4} (*cf.* Kohler); 1^{10} after 1^{7}; and 4^{5} after 3^{4}. In 4^{6} he omitted *that shade should be over his head*, and in 4^{8} he supplied after *east wind: and it tore down the hut.* The transposition of 1^{13} is plausible, and adopted by Bu., but 1^{13} fits even better in its present context, where it is quite significant. See com. The transposition of 1^{10} is not so plausible, but that of 4^{5} seems at first irresistible, and is accepted, *e. g.*, by Marti. There is a real difficulty at this point, but it is not to be solved by a transposition. See below. On 4^{6} and 4^{8} see com.

The next attempt was made by H. Schmidt, who believed that Böhme had pointed out in the main correctly where literary criticism must begin, but had barred himself from a true solution by his hypothesis of two parallel narratives in chs. 3, 4. Schmidt tries to account for various insertions by a religious motive. Thus he thinks that the prayer of thanksgiving in ch. 2^{3-10} (Engl. $^{2-9}$) was inserted because the change from wrath to mercy in the actions of Yahweh appeared to a later reader too abrupt. In ch. 3 it seemed to this reader that God was far too easily reconciled, so he added 3^{6-9}. Similarly in ch. 1 it seemed strange that heathen sailors should be permitted to throw a prophet of Yahweh into the sea

without being punished for it, so he inserted $1^{13.14}$. In each case there is a trait in the narrative which is expanded by the interpolator: in 2^2 *and Jonah prayed* is made definite by 2^{3-10}; the fasting of the nobles in 3^5 is expanded by 3^{6-9}; to the question of the sailors in 1^{12} there were added $1^{13.14}$ to bring out that they had done their utmost to evade the necessity of killing a prophet of Yahweh. In addition to these interpolations Schmidt, heedless of his own criticism of Böhme, regards $1^{4a\alpha.\ 5a\alpha\ b.\ 6.\ 8-10a\alpha}$ as an independent narrative which was woven together with the other. A lacuna before v. ^{8} he fills out by something like, *and Jonah cried to his God and the sea became calm*, and then reconstructs the following outline: "The sailors have treated their passenger in a hostile manner; perhaps they are leading him away against his will, or have robbed him of his possessions. Yahweh hurls a storm upon the sea as a punishment. In vain the robbers cry to their gods; in the greatest need the captain requests also his prisoner, who, certain of the mighty protection of his God, had lain down to sleep unconcerned about the storm, to participate in their prayer. He complies with the request and the storm abates immediately. By the effect of his words the sailors recognise with terror how mighty a man they have treated with hostility, and so they are very much afraid" (p. 297). This story spoke of a trip not of a flight to Tarshish. But the reasons for regarding 3^{6-9} $1^{13.14}$ as interpolations and $1^{4a\alpha.\ 5a\alpha b.\ 6.\ 8-10a\alpha}$ as a part of a different narrative are not strong enough for these assertions.

It may appear worth while to examine Schmidt's arguments somewhat in detail. In 3^7 it seems strange to Schmidt that the King should proclaim the fast again when the subjects are already keeping it (3^5). Besides, he adds, in 3^5 the terms לבש שקים and קרא are used, but in $3^{6.8}$ כסה שקים and in 3^8 זעק.—But is the scene presented in $3^{5ff.}$ not quite consistent? Did the author himself not feel any interest in describing the penitence of everybody, high and low? And does it not often happen that a decree is issued after the people have already taken measures? And must our author always use the same phrases? In 3^8 he could not use the Hiph'il of קרא, so he used a synonym. The reason that Yahweh's grace came too quickly after the sincere repentance of the people seems singularly at fault in view of the teaching of the OT.

In regard to $1^{13.14}$ Schmidt thinks it strange that the sailors should

try to gain the shore in direct contradiction to the will of God as revealed by Jonah; that they should ask Yahweh's pardon when they surrender Jonah and that they should speak of him as innocent. Since v. ^{16} tells of their conversion, the prayer to Yahweh in v. ^{14} which would be the beginning of their adoration of Yahweh, does not fit.—But nothing whatever is said of their conversion to Yahweh! And the other difficulties are not real either.

The reasons for removing $1^{4a\alpha.\ 5a\alpha b.\ 6.\ 8\text{-}10a\alpha}$ and regarding them as a fragment of another narrative are not convincing either. They are as follows. The deep sleep of Jonah is difficult to explain, and strangely enough it is not said what Jonah did after the captain had told him to pray. Moreover, the strange questions of the sailors instead of the simple *What hast thou done?* and the still stranger answer of Jonah with the contradiction of his own flight from Yahweh seem to Schmidt to show that they are extraneous elements in the story. So he removes vv. $^{5b.\ 6.\ 8\text{-}10a\alpha}$. V. $^{5a\alpha}$ also belongs with them because v. ^{6} presupposes the unavailing prayer of the sailors; and one of the doublets in v. ^{4} goes with them too: v. $^{4a\alpha}$ because Yahweh is the author of the storm according to v. ^{9}. So vv. $^{4a\alpha\ 5a\alpha}$ are taken with the other insertions. Again Schmidt tries to fortify these arguments by linguistic differences, thus vv. $^{3a.\ 5a\beta}$ use אניה but v. ^{5b} ספינה; v. $^{4a\beta}$ uses סער but v. $^{4a\alpha}$ רוח.—In regard to סער note that the *verb* is used in v. ^{11} by the other narrative! Besides, רוח is the wind, while סער is used here of the raging of the waves caused by the wind. ספינה is not the same as אניה, but means *the lower deck* and is used most appropriately. So the linguistic argument is futile. It is true, however, that Jonah did probably not pray at the captain's request. But why this should bring an element of incongruity into the narrative is difficult to see, and surely Schmidt's reconstruction of the other narrative at this point is fanciful. Again it is true that the questions of the sailors are not the questions we should have asked, but they are not so incongruous to the narrative that they cannot be part of it. Jonah's answer is probably not preserved in its original form, but it forms so integral a part of the story that we miss something in the story as constructed by Schmidt. He omits (with others) *for he had told them* in v. ^{10}. But then how could the sailors know that he was fleeing from Yahweh? The lot could not tell them that it was *Yahweh* who was pursuing Jonah, and he himself had not told them anything at all. Does Schmidt think that the sailors were Hebrews? or that they had recognised Jonah as a Hebrew? And even then, might he not have offended another deity?

Budde refers to Schmidt's essay rather favourably, and appears to approve the excision of passages which he regards, with Schmidt, as additions due to the desire to emphasise the edifying element of

the story. He says, "You will find that the story runs more smoothly and fluently; whether all stumbling blocks are removed by it also in ch. 4 remains an open question." Unfortunately, Bu. gives no details. In his earlier article in *JE.* he suggested in regard to ch. 4 to omit vv. $^{4.5}$ and in v. ^{8a} *and Yahweh ordered a scorching east wind.* He also transposed there 1^{13} (with Wkl.) after 1^{4}, omitted $1^{8a\beta.\,10b}$ and read in $1^{9b\alpha}$ (with Kohler) "and from the presence of Yahweh. . . . *I am fleeing,*" or he would insert after v.^{9} *and I am fleeing from His presence.* He was inclined to omit 3^{8} also. On the transposition of 1^{13} see above. Bu.'s omission of 4^{8a} seems to be due to his understanding of the wind as the agent of withering the plant. But this is not the author's intention. See com. The omission of 4^{4} is plausible, but not absolutely necessary; that of the whole of 4^{5} as well as of 3^{8} is, however, uncalled for. See com. $1^{8a\beta}$ had already generally been recognised as secondary, and the emendation in $1^{9b\alpha}$ as well as the omission of 1^{10b} which is involved in it are most probable. Whether Bu. would omit now more than in *JE.* is not certain, though his general statements in his *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur* and in his *Prophetisches Schrifttum* lead one to suspect it.

Two interesting, though unconvincing attempts to disentangle the knots by means of metrical criticism were made by Sievers and Erbt. Sievers (1905) regards the story as a unity (except the psalm in ch. 2), and removes only a few glosses which were added, as he thinks, to emphasise the religious element of the story: in 1^{9b} *the God of heaven, who has made the sea and the dry land;* 3^{8b} *and let them turn each one,* etc.; in 4^{2b} *for I know,* etc.; in 3^{5} *in God* (after *believed*); 4^{2} *and he prayed to Yahweh,* similarly 2^{2}, an editorial transition verse for the interpolated psalm. He omits also 4^{5b} but for other and more satisfactory reasons.

Why the author himself should not be responsible for this religious element is difficult to see. For surely it is not out of line with the rest of the book! Schmidt omits entirely different passages from the same motive. The metrical argument can hardly suffice in a story like Jonah, which was certainly not intentionally written in strict metrical form. Neither Müller (1794) and Eichhorn (1819) who printed the book as poetry, nor Siev. and Erbt

appear to me to have proved that we have anything else but beautiful prose in the book (the psalm of course excepted). And though there may be certain measured cadences in its sentences, they are unintentional, and deviations from the metric regularity are to be expected in rhythmic prose. It is not without significance that Siev. and Erbt differ in their metric arrangement. Siev. believes that the book is composed of smooth lines of seven beats each throughout. Erbt thinks it was written partly in lines of seven beats each, partly in lines of alternately three and six beats each.

Erbt (1907) accepts Wkl.'s rearrangement of the order of the text and his insertion in 4^{8}, but he distinguishes two different sources (exclusive of the psalm in ch. 2).

(1). $1^{1-4a\alpha.\ 5a\alpha.\ b.\ 6}$ [Jonah's unavailing prayer or refusal to pray has been omitted] $^{7.\ 10a.\ 8a\alpha b.\ 9.\ 14a}$ . . . [Jonah is then thrown overboard and the storm abates] ^{16} $2^{1a.\ 2}$ 3^{3a} $4^{5a\alpha}$ 3^{6-10} $4^{1-3a.\ 6}$ (except *to be a shade over his head*) ^{7} [add: *but Jonah was very angry*] ^{9} [add at beginning: *and Yahweh said*] $^{10.\ 11}$. (2). $1^{4a\beta b.\ 13.\ 5a\beta}$ . . . $^{11.\ 12.\ 15}$ 2^{1b} . . . $3^{3b.\ 4}$ $4^{5a\beta b}$ 3^{5} . . . $4^{8.\ 9a\alpha}$ . . .

Besides, there are glosses in 1^{1} (*son of Amittai*) ^{3b} (*away from Yahweh*) ^{4} *great* (before *wind*) ^{6} (*the god*) ^{9} (*the God of heaven*) ^{14b} (*for thou, O Yahweh*, etc.) ^{16} (*to Yahweh*) $3^{1.\ 2}$ (*and beast, cattle and sheep*) ^{8} (*man and beast*) ^{9} (*that we perish not*) 4^{2} (*long-suffering and of great goodness*) ^{3} (*Yahweh*) ^{3b} (*for it is better*, etc.) ^{6} (*that shade might be over his head*) ^{11a} (*that great city*) ^{11b} (*and much cattle*).

Erbt believes that both sources were written in metre: the first source, as was said before, in lines of seven beats each, the second in lines of alternately three and six beats each. He regards the two sources as parts of a so-called *Zweiprophetenbuch* and a *Dreiprophetenbuch* which contained the stories of Elijah and Jonah; and Elijah, Elisha and Jonah respectively. He adduces no arguments except the metre. His method is arbitrary and his division untenable. Siev. arrives at an entirely different conclusion by the use of the metre as a literary criterion.

The most recent contribution is by the Roman Catholic scholar Riessler (1911), who is greatly influenced by his predecessors, especially by Böhme, whose curiosities, however, he does not repro-

duce. He believes that the book was worked over several times, one of the revisers added explanatory material, another glosses. These additions are 1^{1} (*the son of Amittai*) $^{4a\beta.\ 8a\beta.\ b}$ (from *and whence doest thou come* on) ^{9b} (in ^{9a} he reads with 𝔊 *I am a servant of Yahweh*) $^{10.\ 11b.\ 13.\ 14.\ 16}$; 2^{3} (except *and he said*) $^{4.\ 5.\ 8\text{-}10}$; $3^{3b.\ 7b}$ (from *they must not feed* on) $^{8.\ 9}$ $4^{1\text{-}4.\ 5b.\ 6a}$ (to *deliver him from his displeasure*) ^{9} (*on account of the ricinus*) ^{10b}.

Ries. gives, as a rule, no reasons for his omissions, perhaps because most of them had been proposed by others. His most noteworthy points are perhaps his view of ch. 2, on which see below, and his omission of 1^{3b} with its graphic, interesting detail. But both are exceedingly improbable.

These manifold different attempts, not a single one of which is convincing, show that there are certain difficulties in the text of our book which must be accounted for. But they must not be magnified. There are real difficulties, *e. g.*, in $1^{8.\ 9}$ 3^{8} 4^{5}, but the remedies needed are slight, and all theories that work with several sources, or with many transpositions, are too artificial to be true. The result of our survey of these proposals and of our detailed exegesis in the commentary is that the book is a unity, with the exception of the psalm ($2^{3\text{-}10}$ Engl. $^{2\text{-}9}$), and that there are several glosses, in 1^{3a} (*Tarshish*), ^{8a} (*on whose account has this come to us*), ^{10b} (due to a mistaken reading in 1^{9} which is to be emended), 3^{8} (*and beasts*) 4^{5b} (due to a mistaken reading in 3^{4} which is to be corrected according to 𝔊).

§ 6. THE PSALM IN CHAPTER 2.

It is a psalm of thanksgiving for help received in great danger, not a prayer for help in the midst of danger. The danger is past, the psalmist is safe. So this cannot be the prayer which Jonah prayed, or which the author of the story would have put into Jonah's mouth, while he was inside the fish, for it does not fit into the situation. Even though the fish was from the very first Yahweh's instrument of deliverance to the narrator, so that from his point of view Jonah was safe as soon as he had been swallowed, he nowhere indicates that his hero thought so too, and this is cer-

tainly not self-evident. To be swallowed by a fish is usually not the same as to be saved! Our author is too good a narrator to omit a point like this.

The psalm would fit better if it followed 2[11]. There a prayer of thanksgiving and praise is in place. In view of the many transpositions, accidental or otherwise, which have occurred in the OT. text, it is not improbable that the psalm has been displaced. And indeed v. [2] and v. [11] go well together, and the psalm follows naturally, *And Jonah prayed to Yahweh his God out of the belly of the fish. And Yahweh spoke to the fish and it threw up Jonah on the dry land. Then Jonah* [*Jonah* must be supplied] *said, Out of my anguish I called to Yahweh*, etc.

Such a transposition is not difficult, and the displacement may be simply accidental. But even then it cannot be maintained that the psalm was composed by the author of the story. If it had been composed by him, he would have fitted it more closely into the situation. As it is, it does not fit very well. It does not mention the fish, nor speak of Jonah's penitence, but quite generally of the experiences of a drowning man, who seemed doomed to death and was yet wonderfully saved by Yahweh upon whom he had called for help. One might try to explain the non-mention of the fish by the singer's ignoring of the instrument in his thanks to the author of his deliverance. And one might say that the fish did not seem so important to the writer as it does to us. But why does he describe so minutely the sinking down to the roots of the mountains and the wrapping of sea-weeds around the singer's head, and say nothing at all of the miraculous deliverance by the fish? Did the latter experience impress him so little? Was it not most extraordinary? One might also, especially if the psalm is placed after v. [11] (Engl. v. [10]), try to explain the lack of reference to Jonah's repentance by assuming that his penitence was voiced in the prayer which he made according to v. [8] and as a result of which Yahweh saved him, and that his promise to obey Yahweh's command, if saved, was expressed in v. [10]. But after all is said that can be said for the fitness of the psalm, it still does not seem to be the kind of psalm which our author would have composed for this particular situation.

Two possibilities present themselves at this point. Either the author selected this psalm, which seemed to him the most appropriate he could find, and inserted it after v. [11] (*sic!*) or a reader inserted it. If the latter view is adopted, we may either assume that the interpolator missed the prayer referred to in v. [2] and put it purposely after v. [2]. To him the fish was the agent of deliverance from the very beginning, and he believed that Jonah could pray this psalm of thanksgiving even in the belly of the fish.* Or we may assume that a reader missed an expression of gratitude on the part of Jonah *after* he had been so miraculously delivered and thrown up on the shore (v. [11]), and so he inserted this psalm in the margin. Thence it was put after v. [2] instead of after v. [11], as he had intended. This latter view appears to me on the whole the more probable.

In any case there can be no doubt that he who placed the psalm here interpreted the phrases connected with drowning literally. But in view of the frequent use in poetry, *cf.*, *e. g.*, Ps. 69[1. 2. 15], of figures of drowning for mortal danger and illness it is not certain that the original poet intended them to be taken literally. He may have used them figuratively.

The literary connection with various postexilic psalms argues for a postexilic date of the psalm. But how early or how late in the postexilic period it belongs we cannot tell. The Heb. is pure and no Aram. influence is apparent.

It has long been noticed that the psalm contains a number of parallels to other psalms. Ps. 18[7] 120[1] use the same phraseology as v. [3a]; Ps. 42[8b] reads exactly like v. [4b] (*all thy breakers and thy billows have passed over me*), but in Ps. 42 this is figurative. Ps. 31[23] is almost the same (except one synonym) as v. [5] (*I said, I am driven out of the sight of Thy eyes*). The connection of Ps. 18[5] 69[2] with v. [6a] is slight. Ps. 30[4] (*Yahweh, Thou hast brought up my soul from Sheol*) is quite similar to v. [7]. With v. [8] cp. Ps. 142[4] 143[4] (*when my spirit* [Jonah: *soul*] *fainted within me*); 18[7] (*may He hear my voice from His holy temple and may my prayer come before Him to His ears*); 5[8] (*into Thy holy temple*); Ps. 88[3] (*may my prayer come before Thee*). Ps. 31[7] has the same phrase (*they*

* The similar example of the prayer of Azariah and of the three men in the furnace (Dn. 3[23]) as well as of the inserted prayer of Hannah (1 S. 2[1-10]) or of the song of Hezekiah (Is. 38[9-20]) may be cited in support of this.

who care for idols) as v. ^{9a}. V. ^{10} = Ps. 42^{5} (*with loud singing and thanksgiving*).

These literary connections, with the exception of v. ^{4b} = Ps. 42^{8b}, are not striking enough to prove more than that the author was steeped in the religious language of the postexilic community. That he should have worked these "quotations" together into a psalm, taking them from these various other psalms, does not seem likely, for the psalm has unity and a certain amount of originality (*cf.* vv. $^{6.\ 7}$). The phrases it has in common with other psalms were the common property of the religious language of the author's day.

Interpretation of the Psalm.—The main lines that have been followed in the course of the history of interpretation are these:

According to the *literal interpretation* Jonah is regarded as actually praying this psalm while inside of the fish. Others who do not believe that the story was intended as actual history, believe that the author of the story (not Jonah himself) composed the psalm and meant it to be taken literally as the expression of gratitude on the part of his hero for his deliverance from drowning. Still others believe that it was inserted (not composed) by the author of the story who interpreted it literally in accordance with the story, or by a later reader, who missed the prayer referred to in v. ^{2} and supplied it from some collection as the one most suitable for Jonah's condition.

According to the *figurative interpretation* the expressions for drowning are all metaphors for deliverance from disaster or mortal illness.

According to the *allegorical interpretation* the psalm refers to the Babylonian exile. Jonah is the symbol of Israel, the fish of the Babylonian world power. Israel is singing in exile this psalm of thanksgiving, which is really "a national liturgy." Hpt. varies the allegorical interpretation somewhat by taking the psalm as a "song of thanks by Israel for deliverance from the Syrian persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes."

In regard to *the composition of the psalm*, Böhme, who considers the entire psalm as a later addition, takes vv. $^{6.\ 7.\ 9}$ and the phrases *in the heart of the sea* (v. ^{4}) and *into Thy holy temple* (v. ^{8}) as interpolations. Ries. regards vv. $^{6.\ 7}$ as the original prayer of Jonah, the rest as later additions. He singles out the most striking and original lines of the psalm. But even then they do not fit the situation and cannot be by the author of the story, even if v. ^{7b} is translated with 𝔊 as a prayer, *O mayest Thou bring up*, etc. Ries. has perceived this and tries to account for it by the theory that the description of v. ^{4} was suggested by another form of the Jonah story which was similar to that of Paul's shipwreck and to the Buddhist story of Mittavindaka (see com. on 1^{7}). But this is pure assumption.

§ 7. THE TEXT OF THE BOOK.

The text is remarkably well preserved, only a few emendations are needed. The few glosses or doublets are easily recognised. On the use of the metre for the textual and literary criticism of the book, see § 5.

§ 8. MODERN LITERATURE.

(1) *Commentaries on all the Minor Prophets.*—Eichhorn, 1819; Ewald, [2]1868 (Engl., 1875); Hitzig, [3]1863; Hitzig-Steiner, [4]1881; Henderson, 1845, [2]1860; Pusey, 1861; Schegg, [2]1862; Keil, [2]1873 (Engl., 1880), [3]1888; von Orelli, 1888 (Engl., 1893), [3]1908; Farrar, 1890; Wellhausen, 1892, [3]1898; G. A. Smith, 1897–98; Nowack, 1898, [2]1903; Marti, 1903; van Hoonacker, 1908; Riessler, 1911.

(2) *Special Commentaries on Jonah.*—F. Kaulen, *Librum Jonae Prophetae exposuit*, 1862; Hugh Martin, *The Prophet Jonah*, 1866, [3]1889; P. Kleinert, in Lange's *Bibelwerk*, 1868 (Engl., 1875), [2]1893; M. M. Kalisch, *Bible Studies*, II, *The Book of Jonah*, 1878; T. T. Perowne, in *Cambridge Bible*, 1879; A. Kahana, in his *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906; J. Halévy, *Recherches Bibliques*, IV, 1907, pp. 190–238; E. Kautzsch, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, II, [3]1910; C. F. Kent, *Student's Old Testament*, III, 1910.

(3) *Monographs and special articles.*—J. G. A. Müller, *Jona, eine moralische Erzählung*, in Paulus' *Memorabilien*, VI, 1794, pp. 142 *ff.* J. C. K. Nachtigal, *Über das Buch des Alten Testaments mit der Aufschrift Jonas*, in Eichhorn's *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*, IX, 1799, pp. 221 *ff.* P. Friedrichsen, *Kritische Übersicht der verschiedenen Ansichten von dem Buche Jonas, nebst einem neuen Versuche über dasselbe*, 1817, [2]1841. F. Hitzig, *Des Propheten Jonas Orakel über Moab kritisch vindicirt*, 1831. F. C. Baur, *Der Prophet Jonas, ein assyrisch-babylonisches Symbol*, in Illgen's *Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, Neue Folge*, I, 1837, pp. 88–114. C. Kohler, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer* (quoted by Farrar, *The Minor Prophets*, p. 236.). T. K. Cheyne, *Jonah: A Study in Jewish Folklore and Religion*, *Theol. Review*,

LVII, 1877, pp. 211–219; article *Jonah*, in *EB.*, II, 1901; *Critica Biblica*, II, 1903, pp. 150–152. K. Kohler, *The Original Form of the Book of Jonah, Theol. Review*, 1879, pp. 139 *ff.* C. H. H. Wright, *Biblical Essays*, 1886, pp. 34–98. W. Böhme, *Die Komposition des Buches Jona, ZAW.*, VII, 1887, pp. 224–284. H. C. Trumbull, *Jonah in Nineveh, JBL.*, XI, 1892, pp. 53–60. K. Budde, *Vermutungen zum Midrasch des Buches der Könige, ZAW.*, XII, 1892, pp. 37 *ff.* John Kennedy, *On the Book of Jonah*, 1895. Briggs, *Works of the Imagination in the OT., North Amer. Rev.*, 1897, pp. 356 *ff.* B. Wolf, *Die Geschichte des Propheten Jona. Nach einer karschunischen Handschrift*, 1897, [2]1899. H. Winckler, *Zum buche Jona, AOF.*, II, 1899, pp. 260–265. Ed. König, article *Jonah*, in *DB.*, II, 1899. H. Schmidt, *Die Komposition des Buches Jona, ZAW.*, XXV, 1905, pp. 285–310; *Absicht und Entstehungszeit des Buches Jona, TSK.*, LXXIX, 1906, pp. 180–199. P. Haupt, *Der assyrische Name des Potwals, AJSL.*, XXIII, 1907, pp. 253–263; *Jonah's Whale, Proceedings of the Am. Philosophical Society*, XLVI, 1907, pp. 151–164. Duhm, *Anmerkungen zu den Zwölf Propheten*, XIV, *Buch Jona, ZAW.*, XXXI, 1911, pp. 200–204. The Introductions to the Old Testament by Eichhorn, [4]1824, Reuss, 1890, Kuenen, 1892, König, 1893, Cornill, 1896, [5]1905 (Engl.), Driver, 1891, [8]1909, Baudissin, 1901, Briggs, *General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture*, 1899, Budde, *Geschichte der althebräischen Litteratur*, 1906; *Das prophetische Schrifttum*, 1906.

On the Psalm in ch. 2.—Gunkel, *Ausgewählte Psalmen*, [3]1911, pp. 288–295, 340 *ff.* W. Stärk, *Die Lyrik des Alten Testaments*, in *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, 1911, pp. 98–100.

On Nineveh.—F. Jones, *Topography of Nineveh, JRAS.*, XV, 1855, pp. 297–397. A. Billerbeck and A. Jeremias, *Der Untergang Nineveh's und die Weissagungschrift des Nahum von Elkosch, BA.*, III, 1898, pp. 87 *ff.* The articles by Sayce, in *DB.*, III, 1900, and by Johns, in *EB.*, III, 1902. L. W. King, *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, . . . in the British Museum*, Part XXVI, 1909.

(4) *Parallel Stories.*—Especially Leo Frobenius, *Die Weltanschauung der Naturvölker*, 1898 (Engl. transl., *Childhood of Man*,

1908); *id.*, *Aus den Flegeljahren der Menschheit*, 1901; *id.*, *Das Zeitalter des Sonnengottes*, 1904. Radermacher, *Walfischmythen*, *ARW.*, 1906, pp. 251 *ff.* H. Schmidt, *Jona. Eine Untersuchung zur vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte*, 1907.

(5) *Text and Metre.*—W. Wright, *The Book of Jonah in . . . Chaldee, Syriac, Aethiopic and Arabic*, 1857. Vollers, *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*, *ZAW.*, IV, 1884, pp. 18 *ff.* Sebök, *Die Syrische Übersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1887. Graetz, *Emendationes in plerosque sacrae Scripturae Veteris Testamenti libros*, II, 1893. Ehrlich, *Mikrâ ki-Pheshutô*, III, 1901. Sievers, *Metrische Studien*, I, 1901, pp. 482–485; *id.*, *Alttestamentliche Miscellen*, 2, in *Berichte über d. Verhandl. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss.*, 57, Band, 1905, pp. 35–45. Rahmer, *Hieronymus' Commentar zu den zwölf kleinen Propheten*, 1902. Oesterley, *The Old Latin Texts of the Minor Prophets*, III, *JTS.*, V, 1904, pp. 378–381; *id.*, *Codex Taurinensis* (Y), *JTS.*, VII, 1906, pp. 520–526. Nowack, in Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*, 1906. Erbt, *Elia, Elisa, Jona*, 1907. Duhm, *Die zwölf Propheten in den Versmassen der Urschrift übersetzt*, 1910.

COMMENTARY ON JONAH.

JONAH'S DISOBEDIENCE AND FLIGHT (1^{1-3}).

Jonah is commanded by Yahweh to go on a prophetic mission to Nineveh but refuses, and tries to escape from this obligation by fleeing on a ship to Tarshish.

1. The tale begins with *And the word of Yahweh came to Jonah, the son of Amittai*, as if it were a continuation, or as if it had been originally one of a cycle of stories. But the phrase *and it came to pass* had in course of time become so much used in narratives that it could stand at the beginning of a story without requiring an antecedent. Thus 1 Samuel, Ruth, Judges, Esther, Nehemiah, Ezekiel begin with it. On Jonah, the son of Amittai, from Gath-Hepher in Zebulon see 2 K. 14^{25} and pp. 8 *f.* How the divine revelation came to Jonah is not specified. Whether it was accompanied by a vision or an audition, or whether it was the voice in his soul that Jonah recognised as Yahweh's command, the author does not say. If the story were history, we would wish to know how such a striking revelation could have come to Jonah, what the historical situation was, and what his own moral and prophetic preparation for this kind of a message consisted in. To try to account for it psychologically is however gratuitous, since the story is a parable and not a historical account.—**2.** Nineveh, Assy. *Ninâ* and *Ninuâ*, was situated on the eastern bank of the Tigris opposite the modern Mosul, north of the greater Zab. It was a very ancient city founded most probably by the Babylonians, Gn. $10^{12f.}$. Sennacherib strongly fortified it and made it the capital of Assyria. But its time of splendour lasted only a century, for in 606 B.C. it was destroyed by the Medes. It was never rebuilt. Our narrator calls Nineveh *that great city* also in 3^3 4^{11}. It was important for his purpose to emphasise that it was such a great city, full of human beings, *cf.* 4^{11}. But it was no longer in exist-

ence in his day, for he speaks of it in 3^{3} as a city of the past. The reason why he chose Nineveh as the place to which Jonah was to go, becomes clear as the story proceeds. Nineveh was the capital of the Assyrians, the bitterest enemies of Israel in pre-exilic times, and as such the best illustration for the author's teaching. Even these cruel Assyrians were objects of Yahweh's care. Even to them He gives an opportunity to repent, and thus to avert the punishment due to them. What Jonah was to *proclaim* or *preach* is not specified here, but *cf.* 3^{4}, for the clause *because their wickedness is come up to me* gives the cause of Yahweh's message not its content. Yahweh dwells in heaven and so the writer in naïve but graphic fashion says, the complaint (*cf.* 𝔊's interpretation) over Nineveh's awful wickedness had come up and appealed to Him, accusing and demanding justice, *cf.* Gn. 4^{10} 18^{21} 1 S. 5^{12} La. 1^{22}. In what the wickedness consisted is not specified, but we know Assyria's cruelties from her own inscriptions as well as from Na. $2^{11, 12}$ $3^{1, 19}$. Yahweh is no longer a local or national deity, but the God of the whole earth, who punishes wickedness wherever He finds it. *Cf.* Am. 1 *f.* The emphasis on Yahweh's sense of justice is necessary for the further development of the story.—**3.** Jonah refused to obey the command. He did rise, but—to flee from the presence of God and to escape from his duty. That he should at once have made up his mind to flee to *Tarshish* is unlikely. But when he arrived at Joppa and found the ship about to sail for Tarshish he quickly decided to take passage. The first mention of Tarshish in our text is therefore either due to prolepsis or, more likely, it is a later insertion. Tarshish (*cf.* Gn. 10^{4}) is most probably to be identified with the Greek Tartessos in the SW. of Spain, near the mouth of the Guadalquivir River (Herodotus, I, 163, IV, 152). It was most probably an ancient Semitic colony (*cf.* Is. $23^{1, 6, 10}$), whose mineral trade with Tyre is mentioned in Ez. 27^{12} (*cf.* also Je. 10^{9}).* It appears to have been the farthest point W. to which the Phœnician merchants went on their

* Other identifications of Tarshish, *e. g.*, with Tarsus in Cilicia (Josephus) or Tunis (AE.) or Carthage (𝔊 in Ez. 27 and Is. 23) are now generally given up. *Cf. EB.*, IV, 4897 *ff.*, *DB.*, IV, 683 *ff.* The identification with the land of the Tyrseni, Etruscans (Knobel, Frz. Del., W. M. Müller) does not commend itself either. And still less does Che.'s suggestion, involving an emendation, that it was the north Arabian Asshur.

large, sea-going vessels, sometimes called *Tarshish-ships*, not because they all went to Tarshish, but because they belonged to the class that could make such extended tours. *Cf.* East India-men. In going to Tarshish the author represents Jonah as going not only exactly in the opposite direction of Nineveh but also as trying to flee as far as possible away from Yahweh's presence. The phrase *away from the face*, or *presence, of Yahweh* is equivalent to *away from Yahweh's land*. *Cf.* Gn. 4^{16} 1 S. $26^{19\,f.}$ 2 K. 5^{17} 13^{23} $17^{20.\,23}$ Je. 23^{39}. Jonah was trying to flee from Palestine in order to escape a second command of Yahweh. Just as a modern believer sometimes thinks of special places where God is more likely to reveal himself than at others, because he has experienced there communion with Him, so Jonah contrariwise in spite of his more advanced conception of God (*cf.* v. ^{9}) thinks he can escape from the presence of God by fleeing as far as possible away from the place where the command of Yahweh had reached him and where He would most likely reveal Himself again to him. Even in still later days Palestine was regarded as the place of Yahweh's special manifestation and presence, though the belief in His omnipresence had long been taught by prophets and psalmists. The reason of Jonah's disobedience and flight is not given here, but it is explicitly stated by him in 4^{2}. It required no special prophetic endowment to divine that Yahweh had a redemptive purpose in this mission. Else He might have instructed Jonah to give the prediction of Nineveh's downfall in Palestine. Jonah would gladly have done this. But to go to Nineveh and give the message there could imply only one thing, that he should warn the Ninevites and try to bring about their repentance.*

Yapho, the nearest seaport of Jerusalem, is the modern Jaffa, ar. *Yāfā*, the Greek Ἰόππη, Acts 9^{36}. It has retained its location and name all through the centuries. In Egyptian inscriptions it

* The rabbis tried to find a high motive in this wholly unparalleled behaviour of a Heb. prophet and so declared that Jonah fled because he knew that the Ninevites would readily avail themselves of the means of averting the coming disaster, and repent, and thus make Israel's disobedience to Yahweh's warning by His prophets and her perseverance in sin appear all the more heinous and worthy of punishment, and her ruin inevitable. Rather than do this, he disobeyed and fled. He was willing to perish (*cf.* v. ^{12}) and like Moses (Ex. 32^{32}) give his life for his people rather than bring about the destruction of Israel by his obedience. See Rahmer, pp. 14 *f.*, where the Jewish sources are quoted.

is called *Yepu*, in the Amarna letters *Yapu*, in Assyrian inscriptions *Yapu*, *Yappû*. See *EB*., II, 2573 *ff*., *DB*., II, 755 *f*. Already in early days a seaport, it was not Israelitish till captured by Jonathan in 148 B.C. (1 Mac. 10^{76}), though cargo destined for Jerusalem was shipped to Joppa and unloaded there in early postexilic times (*cf*. Ezr. 3^{7}), and indeed as early as the time of Solomon, if we may trust the Chronicler, 2 Ch. 2^{16}, *cf*. 1 K. 5^{9} (Heb. 5^{23}).

In Joppa Jonah found a ship which was about to sail for Tarshish. With quick determination he paid his fare and went aboard to sail *with them*, *i. e.*, with the sailors of the ship, to Tarshish to get as far as possible from the awful presence of Yahweh. There is a fine touch of irony in the repetition of this little phrase. Such details as where Jonah got the money for his fare do not trouble the narrator, who differs here from his Jewish commentators to whom the use of the fem. suffix (*her fare*) seemed to indicate that Jonah paid the price of the whole ship. Yalkut naïvely remarks, "Jonah was rich."

1. The name Jonah means *dove*, *cf*. p. 8. אֲמִתַּי 𝔊 𝔙 *Amathi* 𝔖 מַתַּי. אמתי is a derivation of אֱמֶת, *cf*. חֶלְדַּי, חַגַּי. To safeguard the pronunciation a number of mss. read אמיתי. There was a Heb. tradition that the widow of Sarepta who was regarded as Jonah's mother called her son בן אמתי = *son of truth* because Elijah had spoken the truth to her, *cf*. 1 K. 17^{24}, *the word of Yahweh in thy mouth is truth*, אמת. Siev. regarded בן אמתי as an insertion from 2 K. 14^{25}, Wkl., on the other hand, followed by Ries., as interpolated in 2 K. 14^{25} from Jon. 1^{1}. But Siev. and Wkl. have withdrawn their assertion. Wkl.'s argument from Heb. usage is untenable. He thinks that invariably either the father's name or the birthplace are mentioned but never both. See however 1 K. 19^{16}, *Elisha, the son of Shephat of Abelmeholah*.—2. קרא 𝔗 explains correctly אִתְנַבֵּי. עליה = אליה 3^{2}. That על is a local prep. = *upon*, *in Nineveh*, is most improbable. על and אל are frequently confused and later on meant almost the same, esp. to the copyists. 𝔊 adds *κραυγή* = זעקת before רעתם, *cf*. Gn. 18^{20}. We., van H. translate כי by *that*, as if it gave the contents of the message.—3. The first תרשישה is omitted by Böhme and Siev., not only mtr. cs. but also for the reasons stated above. Jerome had already noted its strangeness but did, of course, not omit the first Tarshish. He used it in justification of the general meaning of Tarshish = יַמָּא, *sea*, which 𝔗 gives. מלפני יהוה 𝔗 paraphrases both times מן קדם ראתנבי בשמא דיי'. באה prtc. of imminent fut., Ges. § 116d. The verb בוא is only rarely used of going away from the speaker, but when

so used the limit of the motion is given, Is. 22^{16} Ez. $3^{4.11}$ Gn. 45^{17} 1 S. 22^{5} Is. 47^{5} Nu. 32^{6}, *cf.* BDB. Siev. inserts יונה after ויתן. עמהם *with them, i. e.*, the sailors, who belong to the ship. At the end 𝔖 repeats לברח before מלפני יהוה. שכרה 𝔊 transl. *τὸ ναῦλον αὐτοῦ*, as if it were שכרו. a correct interpretation. **3.** וירד is the Heb. idiom, *went down into the ship*, we say *went on board*, German, *bestieg es*.

THE STORM ON THE SEA (1^{4-6}).

Yahweh pursues Jonah in a terrible storm. The sailors try to save the ship first by prayer then by lightening it as much as possible. Jonah, who had fallen asleep in a corner of the lower deck, is also ordered by the captain to pray to his God.

4. Jonah cannot escape God. Yahweh hurls suddenly a terrible storm upon the Mediterranean Sea, evidently not long after the ship had left Joppa. With a few strokes the author pictures the terrible danger. *The ship threatened to break in pieces*, whether by the force of the waves or by being driven upon the reefs which make the Palestinian coast so dangerous, the author does not say. It is a vivid word he uses, for it represents the ship as an animate being, agitated, full of fear, lit., *it thought it would be broken in pieces*. Whether the writer was conscious of this force when he wrote the word we cannot tell. *Cf.* Mk. 4^{37}.—**5.** The storm was so fierce that the seamen became frightened. They were no Hebrews, but probably Phœnicians, either natives or colonists; some may have been of other nationalities. They invoked the help of their various deities, each one crying to his own god, "ignorant of the truth, but not ignorant of the rule of providence" (Jerome). After the instinctive yielding to the impulse to pray they at once set to work to do all they could to save the ship. They threw overboard the tackle and utensils, whether also the cargo is not altogether certain (though the Heb. term may include it), in order to get relief from the burden of anxiety which lay upon them. We speak of lightening the ship, so that it may more easily respond to the rudders and the oars. The Heb. thinks of the weight as resting as a burden on the mind. For a similar use of the phrase, *cf.* Ex. 18^{22}. Meanwhile Jonah was unconscious of it all. He had gone down to the lower deck, and there he had laid himself down

in a corner and had fallen into a deep sleep. Whether his sleep was due to his extreme exhaustion produced by his hasty flight or to some other cause the writer does not say. His commentators have thought it worth while to disagree about it. For the narrative itself this sleep is important because it explains what Jonah was doing in this hour of danger. It satisfies the reader's or listener's curiosity and prepares for the graphic and interesting interview of the captain with Jonah.—**6.** The captain in going all over the ship came upon the sleeping Jonah in his corner on the lower deck. In his astonishment he shouts, *what do you mean by sleeping!* how can you sleep in such a storm! *get up and pray to thy God!* Astonishment is certainly in his tone, but whether also harshness and threat we cannot tell. He does not recognise him as a Hebrew nor does he mention the name of Jonah's God. Still less does he recognise him as a prophet whose prayer would be especially efficacious. He wants him to do something and not lie around and sleep. *Perhaps the God* (here not equivalent to God, the one absolute ruler of the world, but rather = *thy God*) *will give a thought to us* and help us *so that we do not perish.* The attention of the deity is called to the suppliant by his prayer. He may have forgotten or overlooked him. There is no hint that the captain thought that Jonah had intentionally refrained from praying and that he feared that Jonah's defiance of God was ominous. In such fearful danger every one must do his share, no one must be idle. Since the sailors were doing all they could to save the ship, the only thing that Jonah could do was to pray. What a scene! The heathen sailor admonishes the Heb. prophet to pray! The narrator does not tell whether Jonah obeyed the command and we may therefore think that this was self-evident and for that reason omitted, or preferably that he simply rose and followed the captain to the upper deck. That he should have stayed where he was, and proceeded to sleep again after the captain had left him, is excluded by the following. Thoughts such as, *e. g.*, how could he pray to Yahweh in his disobedience, did not trouble the narrator. The story moves quickly and passes over these details. It is interesting to note the assumption that the stranger's God is perhaps willing to help them all, if only his attention is directed to their need.

4. Note the emphatic position of ויהוה, *but Yahweh on his part.*—הטיל is one of the author's favourite words, *cf.* 1^5. 12. 15^. 𝔊 om. גדולה, so also GASm., Now.[2] (but not Now.[K]). על־הים = אל־הים. GASm. om. כים. חִשְּׁבָה לְהִשָּׁבֵר, 𝔙 *periclitabatur conteri.* 𝔗 בְּעָיָא לְאִתְּבָרָא, *sought to break in pieces.* The French *penser* is used in the same way.—**5.** 𝔗 adds after *and they cried each one to his God:* וַחֲזוֹ אֲרֵי לֵית בְּהוֹן צְרוֹךְ, *and when they saw that it was of no use.* הַכֵּלִים *cf.* σκεύη, Acts 27^19^. ויונה is a circumstantial clause, and as such to be translated by the plupf., else we get the unjustifiable meaning that he went down at the time of the storm when the others were doing all they could to save the ship. This is most improbable. ירכתי הספינה, *the innermost parts of the lower deck,* 𝔗 לְאַרְעִית שִׁדָּא. The unusual word ספינה which occurs only here in the OT. is frequent in Aram., but this does not necessarily mean that it is an Aram. loan-word. On the contrary from the root ספן we get the idea that it means properly the *covered* ship, the vessel with a deck, and therefore here, where the lower deck is referred to, ספינה is more properly used than אניה. It so happens that this is the only occurrence of the word in the OT., but also the only passage where the lower deck is referred to. Du. transl. correctly, *in den äussersten Winkel des Verdecks.* וַיֵּרָדַם pausal form with pathaḥ, Ges. § 51 m. The vb. is used of deep, heavy sleep.—**6.** Since חֹבֵל is a denominative from חֶבֶל, *rope,* it means *rope-puller, sailor,* Ez. 27^8. 27. 28. 29^. *Cf.* כֹּרֵם, *vineyard-keeper* from כֶּרֶם, *vineyard.* For the use of the coll. sg. in this connection *cf.* רַב סָרִיס, *chief eunuch,* 2 K. 18^17^. The prtc. נרדם is not vocative (*O sleeper,* AV., RV.), in which case it should have the art., but it is used here as מעברים in 1 S. 2^24^ or as the inf. in Ps. 50^16^ with מה לך, *cf.* Ges. § 120 b, = *what are you doing asleep? what do you mean by sleeping?* יתעשת is used elsewhere only in Dn. 6^4^ (עֲשִׁית), and is clearly an Aramaism. It means *to think,* 𝔙 *recogitet.* לנו *for us, for our benefit. Cf.* חשב ל, Ps. 40^18^. Che. emends to יִתְחַשֵּׁב (or יְחַשֵּׁב), *EB.*, II, 2566 n. 2. 𝔗 יְתְרַחֵים, GASm. similarly: *will be gracious,* 𝔊 διασώσῃ = יוֹשִׁיעַ, *will save,* so also 𝔖. But 𝔐 is correct.

THE DISCOVERY OF JONAH AS THE GUILTY ONE (1^{7-10}).

Believing that the storm was sent by a deity in pursuit of a guilty offender on board their own vessel, the sailors throw lots to discover him. The lot falls on Jonah. The men ask him for particulars about himself and he confesses to their horror that he is a Hebrew who is fleeing from Yahweh, the God of heaven, the creator of the dry land and of the sea.

7. After v. [6] there is a brief pause in the narrative. Some think that something has been lost, but that is hardly necessary. The storm shows no sign of abating, and the sailors now fear that an offended god has sent the storm on account of some one on the ship whom he wants to punish. This is an old belief, *cf.* Jos. $7^{10\,ff.}$ 1 S. $14^{41\,ff.}$, shared by many peoples of antiquity. Of course, not every storm was interpreted as a sign of wrath on the part of the deity. It was not until the sailors had exhausted every other means that they thought of this last possibility. But how could the guilty one be discovered? Where man's wisdom is not sufficient, the divine decision is sought. The narrator uses here a device that is common all through antiquity, the casting of lots, *cf.* Pr. 16^{33} Acts 1^{26}. Even the Urim and Tummim were sacred lots through which Yahweh announced His will. The decision of the lot was authoritative and final, because it was regarded as God's own decision. ***And they said one to another, come let us cast lots, that we may know for whose sake this disaster has come upon us.*** Evil is here physical evil, misfortune, disaster. The lots were either stones or other articles. When the lot fell upon Jonah there was no doubt in the minds of the men that he was the cause of the deity's anger, and they would, of course, not ask him after the decision to tell them ***for whose sake this disaster had come upon them***, as 𝔐 intimates in a gloss on v. [8].—There is an exact parallel to this episode in the Buddhist story of Mittavindaka from Benares, who had gone to sea in disobedience to the command of his mother. The ship suddenly came to a stop on the sea and could not be made to proceed. The sailors cast lots in order to discover on whose account this calamity had happened. Three times the lot marked Mittavindaka as the guilty one. Whereupon the sailors set him adrift on a float with virtually the same words that the sailors use as they throw Jonah overboard, "many must not perish on account of this one." The boat then continued its trip. (E. Hardy, *Jona c.* 1 *und Jāt.* 439, in *ZDMG.*, 1896, p. 153).—**8.** The strange passenger may have excited the suspicion of the sailors before, they knew nothing of him, he was none of their number. So they naturally want to find out what kind of man he is and ask him, ***What is thy business? sc.*** here on this ship,

why are you taking this trip? This is the meaning of the question, rather than *what is thy occupation*, as if that were the reason for God's anger. Tell us, *where dost thou come from? What is thy* (*native*) *country? And what is thy nationality?*—**9.** Jonah's answer is brief and remarkable. He only replies to the question of his nationality, *I am a Hebrew*. This is the name which Israelites use with foreigners, *cf.* Gn. 40^{15} Ex. 2^{7} 3^{18}, etc. Nationality and religion go together: *And I worship Yahweh, the God of heaven who made the sea and the dry land*. He does not insist on his special piety, but simply on his religious connection. He is a Yahweh worshipper. And quite in prophetic style he proceeds to describe Yahweh as the *God of heaven*. This was a common title of Yahweh in postexilic times, as not only the documents in the book of Ezra but also the Jewish Aramaic papyri of Elephantine show. Yahweh's omnipotence and transcendence are expressed in this appellation. It is interesting to note that Jonah adds at once to this confession before the Phœnician sailors, some of whom worshipped as their chief god *Baʿal Shāmēn*=*the Lord of heaven*, that Yahweh had *made the sea and the dry land*. By proclaiming himself a servant of Yahweh, the God of heaven, who had made and who controlled the sea and the dry land, he made clear that Yahweh had sent this storm upon the sea. And since the lot had pointed him out as the culprit, that Yahweh was pursuing *him*. The narrator does not represent Jonah as becoming conscious of the incongruity of his flight and of his belief, though Jonah realises that he cannot escape Yahweh anywhere on land or sea. Such contradictions in religious belief and practice are frequent enough in life. Note the incongruity of believing in monotheism and at the same time denying God's relation of grace and love to the nations, which our author combats. Now it cannot be denied that the simple and beautiful dignity of Jonah's answer is most surprising and altogether unexpected at this point. It is sometimes claimed that Jonah in giving this answer had become Yahweh's missionary to the heathen in spite of himself. But that was surely not in the author's mind. And it seems much more likely and much more in keeping with the entire narrative to assume that originally the text read here slightly differ-

ently, *I am fleeing from Yahweh, the God of heaven*, etc. This was changed later, accidentally or purposely, to *I worship Yahweh, the God of heaven*.—**10.** Jonah's confession produced great fear among the sailors. They did not know the reason of his flight, for he had not said anything about it to them. They thought him a criminal, perhaps a murderer fleeing from justice, whom the angry god (who was in control of the sea as well as of the dry land) was pursuing in the storm on the sea. And full of horror they exclaimed, *What hast thou done!* They do not ask for information about the nature of his crime, but are horrified at his bold attempt to flee from the Almighty God. The author of the alteration in v. [9] added in v. [10], as an explanation of the exclamation of the sailors, *for the men knew that he was fleeing from the presence of Yahweh*. And a reader of the altered text of v. [9], wondering how the sailors could know why he had fled, and interpreting their knowledge in line with vv. [1-3], wrote in the margin, *for he had told them*. This was introduced into the text later on. But its secondariness is apparent from the awkward construction in which the two causal sentences follow each other without connection.

7. בשלמי, consists of ב + שׁ + ל + מי. The rel. part. שׁ = אשׁר, is used occasionally in early N. Israelitish, frequently in later writings, prevailingly in NH. ל was joined to שׁ, *cf.* Aram. דיל, always before pron. sfs., שֶׁלִּי, etc., *cf.* v. [12]. So here שֶׁלְּמִי. By the addition of מִי the whole becomes interrogative, *on account of whom?* lit. *on account of that which concerns whom?* See v. [8]. *Cf.* BDB., Ges. § 150k. 𝕿 בְּדִיל מָה.—**8.** באשר למי is the Heb. equivalent of בשלמי, but is so singular and clumsy that it can only be regarded as an explanation of בשלמי, and since the whole sentence באשר למי הרעה הזאת לנו is merely a repetition of v. [7aβ], we may be sure that we have to do with a marg. n. which found its way into the text. The question is, moreover, meaningless here, since the men had discovered by lot who the guilty one was. It is not found in several Heb. mss. or in 𝕲[Bא] and is omitted by many scholars. Orelli, who defends its genuineness, thinks that the men wanted to find out whether Jonah was willing to acknowledge his guilt and thus confirm the correctness of the lot. מה מלאכתך *what is thy business?* Ehr. correctly, *was ist der Zweck deiner Reise?* Pu. "this particular *business* in which he was engaged, and for which he was come on board." Siev. takes it as meaning, *what hast thou done?*—**9.** עברי, 𝕲 *δοῦλος κυρίου* = עֶבֶד יהוה. 𝕲 took the י for an abbreviated יהוה. 𝕸 is preferable. 𝕿 יְהוּדָאָה. Siev.

om. *the God of heaven* and regards also the rel. cl. *who has made the sea and the dry land* as a gloss intended to heighten the religious element of the text. He explains v. ^{9a} *I am afraid of Yahweh* that is why I hid myself, and finds that with this confession the proud assertion of belief in Yahweh as the Lord of heaven and earth and the sea is not compatible. His main argument is however metrical, the words do not fit into the hexameter scheme in which, acc. to Siev., the Book of Jonah is composed.

In our exposition we have assumed as the orig. text ומלפני יהוה אני בֹּרֵחַ (with Kohler, Bu.).—**10.** ברח, prtc. denotes present continuance of the action. We., Now., Marti, Siev. omit כי הגיד להם as a gloss. The rest of v. ^{10b} must also be omitted as secondary (with Böhme, Bu., Wkl.). Wkl. transposes v. ^{10} after v. ^{7}, regards v. ^{10b} and in v. ^{8a} the phrases, *and they said to him* and *on whose account has this evil come to us?* as secondary. But this is not necessary. מה זאת עשית is not a question for information, but an exclamation of horror. *Cf.* Gn. 3^{13}.

THE STILLING OF THE STORM BY THROWING JONAH INTO THE SEA (1^{11-16}).

Anxiously the sailors ask Jonah what they should do with him in order that the storm may cease. And he tells them to cast him into the sea, for he was sure that the storm had come on his account and that it would cease, if he were thrown overboard to placate the angry deity. The men follow his advice, but not before vainly trying once more to reach the shore and addressing a passionate prayer to Yahweh not to hold them guilty of murder, since He Himself had so plainly indicated His will. As soon as Jonah is cast into the sea, the storm ceases and the sea grows calm. Overawed by Yahweh's might, and full of gratitude for His deliverance, the sailors offer sacrifices and make vows to Yahweh.

11. Meanwhile the sea was becoming more and more angry. It seemed that Yahweh demanded the surrender of Jonah. But since the sailors did not know Him, they could not be sure. They were afraid to offend Him. *Cf.* 2 K. 17^{26}. So they ask Jonah, *What shall we do to thee that the sea grow calm and cease from (raging) against us?* Perhaps he knew how to allay the anger of God. The clause at the end, *for the sea was raging more and more,* may be a part of the narrative or a part of the words of

the sailors. In v. [13] it is a part of the narrative and so probably here also.—**12.** Jonah tells them to throw him overboard, *for I realise,* he says, *that it is for my sake that this great tempest is upon you.* He had not gained this knowledge by the decision of the lot, but by the voice of his conscience. And he knew that the storm would be calmed by his sacrifice, for then the reason for the storm would be removed. It was an ancient sailor's custom to quiet the stormy sea by turning the guilty person adrift or throwing him overboard when it had become evident that the god of the sea demanded it. *Cf.* the story of Mittavindaka given above at v. [7].—**13.** But the sailors hesitated to follow Jonah's advice. They were in doubt whether Yahweh would be pleased with it. They did not know what Jonah had done, and could not be sure that all that Yahweh wanted might not simply be his return to the land. So they tried their utmost to reach the shore. The narrator had said nothing of any previous attempt on their part to reach the shore and this is quite in line with what we know about the custom of sailors during storms along the Palestinian coast. Usually they prefer to seek the open sea rather than risk being wrecked upon the reefs of the dangerous coast line. But now they rowed with all their might to get back to the shore. In vain! When they saw that it was impossible and that the sea instead of becoming calmer began to rage still more, they perceived that Yahweh's will was in accord with Jonah's suggestion. —**14.** So they decided to throw Jonah overboard, but before doing so, they cried to Yahweh and implored Him not to look upon this act as if it were the shedding of innocent blood, and not to hold them guilty of the death of this man. Yahweh might side after all with his worshipper and avenge his death upon them. So they told Yahweh in their prayer that they were doing nothing but His will, for He had sent the storm, had indicated by the decision of the lot that Jonah was the guilty cause of it, and He had not aided them in their attempt to get back to the coast in order to put Jonah off the ship. They did not regard Jonah as innocent, their words *and do not lay upon us innocent blood* expound the words *do not let us perish for the life of this man.* They merely express that the sailors did not commit the crime of wilful murder.

Yahweh himself had pointed him out as guilty and Jonah himself had acknowledged that he was the cause of the storm and Yahweh as well as Jonah had demanded that they throw him into the sea. *Thou Thyself, O Yahweh, hast caused this according to Thy will.*—**15.** Directly after they had cast Jonah overboard, the sea grew calm and ceased from its fury. The term used here makes the sea animate, it had been angry, full of wrath, now it was calm, appeased.—**16.** The sailors, profoundly impressed by the sudden calm and overawed by this manifestation of Yahweh's power, *feared Yahweh with a great fear.* At once they offered sacrifices and vowed to pay their homage to Him after reaching their destination. What they vowed the narrator does not say. He did not feel the difficulty of the older exegetes whence the sailors took the sacrificial animals. He does not say that they were converted and became henceforth true Yahweh-worshippers, but rather describes a scene which harmonises with ancient religion and its recognition of the existence of many gods.

11. וְיִשְׁתֹּק, *in order that it be calm*, for waw conj. with impf. in a final clause after an interrogative sentence *cf.* Ges. § 165a. מעלינו pregnant constr., *cease from (raging) against us.* הלך in combination with another vb. denotes progressive action, Ges. § 113u. הוֹלֵךְ וְסֹעֵר, *was raging more and more.*—**12.** בְּשֶׁלִּי = לְמַעֲנִי, see note on v. 7. Siev. om. מעליכם mtr. cs.—**13.** חתר means lit. *dig*, here *dig (oars) into the water = row*, 𝔗 וְשַׁיְטִין, 𝔙 *remigabant.* 𝔊 παρεβιάζοντο *made efforts* (with the oars). Gr. thinks that 𝔊's Heb. text was perhaps ויתחזקו, Vol. ויתחרו, but more likely it was the same as 𝔐. להשיב, *to bring back, sc.* the ship. Siev. rearranges the order by reading ולא יכלו להשיב אל־היבשה on account of the rhythm.—**14.** אָנָּה from אָהּ + נא, "a strong part. of entreaty, *ah, now! I* (or *we*) *beseech thee!*" BDB. 𝔗 beautifully קַבֵּיל בָּעוּתָנָא, *accept our petition!* 𝔙 *quæsumus.* בנפש, *cf.* 2 S. 14[7], 𝔗 בְּחוֹבַת נְפַשׁ; for דם נקיא 𝔗 חוֹבַת דַם זַכַּי. נקיא is written here with א as in Jo. 4[19]. Siev. om. יהוה after אתה mtr. cs. 𝔖 transl. *Thou art Yahweh and*, but this is wrong.—**15.** עמד מן like the German *abstehen von, cease, cf.* Gn. 29[35] 30[9]. זעף is used only here of the raging of the sea, else it is used of strong emotions.—**16.** Siev. (*Metrik*) regarded both את יהוה and ליהוה as glosses, but Marti insisted rightly that the characteristic element would then be taken away. Siev. now (*Miscellen*) regards only one, preferably את יהוה, as secondary. 𝔊[N] om. ליהוה. 𝔗 ואמרו לדבחא דבח, *and they promised to offer sacrifices* (after they had reached the shore).

JONAH'S DELIVERANCE, $2^{1.\ 2.\ 11}$ (ENGL. 1^{17} $2^{1.\ 10}$).

By Yahweh's command Jonah was at once swallowed alive by a huge fish and remained in its stomach three days and three nights. Then he prayed to Yahweh, who commanded the fish to throw him up on the shore.

2^1 (Engl. 1^{17}). *Then Yahweh ordered a great fish to swallow Jonah.* The translation *prepared* (AV., RV.) is misleading, for the fish was not created at that instant but ordered by Yahweh to do His bidding which it instantly did. *Cf.* also v. [11]. The later Jews believed that God created this fish on the day of creation and held it in readiness for Jonah. The Heb. speaks simply of a *great fish*, not of a whale. Commentators have thought of a large shark (*squalus carcharias*), Quandt and more recently P. Haupt of a cachalot or sperm-whale. But the author did not specify the kind of fish; whether he was not interested in this or did not know enough about it, we cannot tell. He had probably heard stories of huge sea-monsters which had swallowed men whole and alive. The fish has no other purpose in the story than to swallow Jonah and thus to save him from drowning and eventually to bring him back to the shore. Haupt believes that it was brought into the story "in order to transport the disobedient prophet as speedily as possible from Joppa, the seaport of Jerusalem, to Alexandretta, the terminus of the shortest route from the Mediterranean to Nineveh." But our author does not say where Jonah was ejected, *cf.* v. [11], and others have therefore guessed that he was brought back to the coast of Joppa. The *three days and three nights* which Jonah was in the fish must not be cut down to but little more than twenty-four hours in order to minimise the miraculous element. For this is of little avail, even if it were possible to interpret three days and three nights thus, since it does not do away with the extraordinary miracle. Nor is it necessary, since the story is not a historical account. Of course, the phrase *three days and three nights* need not be pressed to mean *exactly* seventy-two hours. To collect stories, as has often been done, in order to corroborate the miracle is beside the mark, even if they were well authenticated,

and even if it could be proved that a man can live three days and three nights in the stomach of a huge fish without being suffocated. For the story belongs in the same class with the many stories of men swallowed and saved by large fishes which are told the world over. They all are folk tales. Our author lets Jonah stay in the fish three days and three nights in order to make a stronger impression on the reader as well as on the prophet who is to be taught obedience by it.—**2** (Engl. v. [1]). *And Jonah prayed to Yahweh his God.* This refers now, as the text stands, to the psalm in vv. [3-10] (Engl. vv. [2-9]). But this psalm is interpolated, see pp. 22 *f.*, and our author meant here not the psalm but a prayer for deliverance, the words of which are not given. V. [2] speaks of a prayer which was prayed *in the stomach of the fish*, not after the deliverance from the fish, while the psalm is not a prayer for deliverance but a thanksgiving after deliverance. V. [2] is sometimes regarded as the introductory part of the interpolation. Marti, *e. g.*, thinks that our author would not have repeated the subject, *Jonah*, or the place, *from the belly of the fish*, from v. [1]. But it is easier to account for the insertion of the psalm if v. [2] was already in the narrative. Besides, the repetition in the light of ch. 1 becomes even significant. For we are not told (though it is usually assumed) that Jonah *prayed to Yahweh his God* after the captain had told him to do so. It is more likely that he did not. But now Jonah, who had fled out of the sight of his God, *prayed out of the stomach of the great fish* in the deep sea *to Yahweh his God!* The terrible experience had made him pliable. Then followed in the original story v. [11].—**11** (Engl. v. [10]). *And Yahweh* heard his prayer and *spake unto the fish.* The words of the command are not given but implied in the following as so often in Heb. speech: *it vomited out Jonah upon the dry land.* Where, we are not told. Somewhere on the Palestinian coast, we may suppose. To attempt to determine the place is futile, see on v. [1].

1. וימן, 𝔊 *προσέταξεν*, 𝔙 *præcepit* is a favourite word of our author, *cf.* 4[6. 7. 8]. It means *to number, assign, appoint, order*, in the latter meaning only in late books (*cf.* BDB.). מעי here = *stomach.* 𝔙 omits *three days and.*—**2.** הדגה the fem. is used only here of a single fish, elsewhere it is used collectively. Since the masc. הדג occurs three times in

this ch. (vv. 1ab. 11) we are justified in regarding הדגה as a scribal error for הדג (so also Kue.). Others think the use of the fem. is a sign of late date. The grotesque explanations of the rabbis may be found in the article *Jonah* in *JE*. The quotation in Mt. 12^{40} is taken literally from 𝔊.

11 (Engl. v. 10). For ויאמר 𝔊 reads *προσετάγη*, as if it had read a form of צוה, *cf.* 𝔊's transl. *προσέταξεν* for וימן in 2^1 $4^{6.\,7}$. It omitted יהוה, perhaps its orig. had an abbreviation which 𝔊 overlooked. 𝔖 also reads ופקד, apparently a free transl. 𝔐 is superior to 𝔊 𝔖.

A PRAYER OF THANKSGIVING, $2^{3\text{-}10}$ (ENGL. $2^{2\text{-}9}$).

3 [2] Out of my anguish I called
  to Yahweh and He answered me,
Out of the midst of Sheol I cried,
  Thou heardest my voice.
4 [3] Thou didst cast me into the heart of the seas,
  and the floods surrounded me,
All Thy breakers and billows
  passed over me.
5 [4] And I, I thought, I am cast out
  from Thy sight:
How shall I ever again look
  toward Thy holy temple?

6 [5] The waters encompassed me to suffocation,
  the deep surrounded me,
Sea-weeds were wrapped about my head
7 [6] at the bottom of the mountains.
I had gone down to the land whose bars
  are everlasting bolts,
But Thou broughtest my life up from the pit,
  O Yahweh, my God.
8 [7] When my soul fainted within me,
  I remembered Yahweh,
And my prayer came unto Thee
  into Thy holy temple.

9 [8] Those who pay regard to vain idols
  forsake their (true) refuge.

10 [9] But I with loud thanksgiving
  will sacrifice to Thee,
What I have vowed I will perform,
  for help belongs to Yahweh.

The psalm is composed of pentameters, so-called *ḳinah*-lines. Usually two together are regarded as forming strophes of four half-lines each. The only exception to this is v. 9 where we have a single *ḳinah*-line. Reuss and Marti think that the other line has been accidentally

omitted. The latter suggests that it was something like *But I trust in Thee, O Yahweh my Saviour! cf.* Ps. 31^7. Böhme and Du. regard v. ^{9} as interpolated. Dr. Briggs regards the psalm as consisting of "two complete strophes [vv. $^{3-5}$ and vv. $^{6-8}$] concluding each with a refrain and . . . half a strophe [vv. $^{9.\,10}$] without a refrain." If the phrase *unto Thy holy temple* in vv. $^{5.\,8}$ is indeed a refrain, Dr. Briggs' arrangement is undoubtedly correct. But we cannot be quite sure that the author intended it as a refrain, though occurring, as it does, twice at the end of six lines it is very likely that he did. We would be surer, if it occurred again. Dr. Briggs assumes that it did originally, for he continues, "This shows that the prayer is only part of a longer piece which must have been complete and symmetrical as we see from the parts given to us." The metre demands that the first two words of v. ^{7} (*to the ends of the mountains*) be taken with v. ^{6} as the second part of the *ḳinah*-line. This necessitates a slight change in the preposition. Kau. and Siev. retain the masoretic division of v. ^{7} and believe that the second part of the second *ḳinah*-line in v. ^{6} is missing. But this spoils the *ḳinah* rhythm in v. ^{7} also.—On the authenticity of the psalm, see pp. 21 *ff.*

3 (Engl. v. ^{2}). In the first two lines the theme of the psalm is stated. In mortal anguish the author had called on Yahweh and He had heard his cry. He had been so near death when he cried to Yahweh that he seemed to be (as he says hyperbolically) in the midst of Sheol. But now the danger is past, as the tenses clearly show, *cf.* v. ^{7}. The mortal peril is not specified, but there can be no doubt that the one who inserted the psalm interpreted the distress in accordance with the story. The original author may have used these expressions figuratively of mortal illness, as, *e. g.*, the author of Ps. 69 had done. But here in Jonah the description of drowning is consistent all through, not as in Ps. 69, where the phrases are figurative and soon abandoned for other terms descriptive of the distress of the singer. Sheol, the nether world, is personified here as a monster with a belly, in Is. 5^{14} its large mouth is spoken of. The phrase *out of the belly of Sheol I called* seemed to the inserter to refer to the belly of the fish, but it has in reality nothing to do with it. V. ^{3} is similar to Ps. 18^7 30^3 120^1. For the same hyperbolic expression of threatened death *cf.* Ps. 18^6 30^4.—**4** (Engl. v. ^{3}). The third line begins the description of the psalmist's distress. It is grammatically closely connected with the preceding, *and Thou didst cast me.* We should

expect (*for*) *Thou didst cast me*, and we may translate thus, for it explains how the psalmist got *into the belly of Sheol*. As so often, Yahweh is regarded as the author of the calamity, and secondary causes are not mentioned. The metre which is quite regular in this psalm demands the omission of one word in the first line, and most probably *the deep* (*cf.* Mi. 7^{19} Ps. 68^{23}) should be omitted, for it is synonymous with *the heart of the seas*. *Cf.* Ez. $27^{4.26}$. The *streams* (for pl. *v. i.*) which surround him are the floods and currents of the sea, *cf.* Ps. 24^{2}, where the floods are parallel to the seas. *All Thy breakers and Thy billows passed over me* seems to have been taken from Ps. 42^{8}. There the terms are used figuratively. —**5** (Engl. v. ^{4}). In despair *I thought* (lit. *I said*), *I am driven out of the sight of Thine eyes*, *i. e.*, out of the land of the living, where Yahweh rules and sees everything. *Cf.* Is. 38^{11}, *I said, I shall not see Yahweh in the land of the living, nor shall I see men any more with the inhabitants of the world.* Acc. to the old idea Yahweh had nothing to do with the nether world, He was a God of the living and not of the dead. This conception persisted even after others had been introduced. The inserter of the psalm may well have seen here a point of connection with 1^{3}. There Jonah fled away from the presence of Yahweh, here he realises that he has been banished from Him, out of His sight. In the continuation 𝔐 introduces an element of hope, *Surely I shall yet again look upon Thy holy temple*, but this is so manifestly premature and so out of keeping with the context that the reading of 𝔊, which involves the change of a single vowel, must be followed, *How shall I ever again look upon Thy holy temple?* A question of despair, it is impossible! *Cf.* Gn. 39^{9} Ps. 137^{4}. To the Hebrew the temple at Jerusalem was the seat where Yahweh dwelt. Surprising as the reference to it here may seem to us who would have thought rather of the light of heaven in such a connection and therefore of the heavenly temple in which Yahweh dwelt, to the devout Jew this was natural. For he thought of Yahweh as living among His people, toward the temple he looked when he prayed and into the temple the prayer would come to Yahweh who heard it, *cf.* v. ^{8}. Thither he would go to worship, sacrifice, render thanks and enter into communion with his God, *cf.* v. ^{10}. The psalm-

ist feels that this will henceforth be impossible for him, for he is doomed to death. V. ^{5b} is almost exactly like Ps. 31^{23}.—**6** (Engl. v. ^{5}). The Heb. idiom, *The waters closed in upon me*, *cf.* Ps. 18^{5}, *unto the soul*, means either *until I could not breathe, to suffocation*, or *unto (my) life*, German: *gingen mir ans Leben*, *cf.* Ps. 69^{2} (figuratively), threatened my life. He had sunk deep down to the ends or *roots of the mountains*, down to the foundations of the earth; in Ecclus. 16^{29} both the roots of the mountains and the foundations of the earth are mentioned together. The Hebrews believed that the earth was founded upon the subterranean ocean, Ps. 24^{2}, and that the ends of the mountains, the pillars of the earth, went deep down to its foundations, *cf.* Ps. 18^{16}. Down there *sea-weeds were wound around* the psalmist's *head*, a gruesome turban, with which he was about to enter the land from which no wanderer returns.—**7** (Engl. v. ^{6}). The first two words of v. ^{7} go with v. ^{6} (*v. s.*). The singer had sunk down lower and lower and had arrived at the gates of *the land whose gate-bars are eternal bolts*, which are never opened again after the wanderer has once been admitted. It is the gate of the land of the dead through which the dead soul enters: Sheol, which lay, as the ancient Hebrews believed, below the subterranean ocean. Here the drowning man had arrived, at the gates of death, when Yahweh suddenly saved him. The Babylonian ideas of the nether world were so similar that it is possible to fill out the fragmentary notices of the OT. by Babylonian parallels, *cf.* Zimmern, *KAT.*^{3}, pp. 637, 642, Friedr. Delitzsch, *Das Land ohne Heimkehr* (1911). Sheol is protected by walls and gates, which are also mentioned in Is. 38^{10} Ps. 9^{14} Jb. 38^{17} Ps. Sol. 16^{2} Wisd. 16^{13} Mt. 16^{18}; its gate-bars are mentioned in Jb. 17^{16}, but the text there is not certain. Usually the thought seems to be of a fortified city, here it is of a land, *cf.* Ex. 15^{12}, also in Babylonian it is *irṣitum, land*, *cf.* Dl., *l. c.*, p. 37. The text adopted above differs from 𝔐 only in the omission of one consonant. 𝔐 reads *the land whose bars* [were closed] *behind me forever*. The words in brackets are not in the original. *The pit* from which Yahweh brought up the psalmist is Sheol. With v. ^{7b} *cf.* Ps. 30^{4}, also 1 S. 2^{6} and the prayer of Asurbanipal (K. 2487), where Ninib is praised as the one who brings back the body of the one that had

been brought into the nether world (Dl., *l. c.*, p. 40). We should have expected a reference to the fish at this point, if the psalm had been written by the author of the story of Jonah for this particular place.—**8** (Engl. v. ^{7}). *When my soul was fainting within me, I remembered Yahweh*, *cf.* Ps. 142^4 143^4 where the same phrase is used (except *my spirit* for *my soul*, some mss. have this also here). *And my prayer came to Thee into Thy holy temple*, *cf.* Ps. 5^8 18^7 88^3. The inserter of the psalm interpreted this, of course, as the prayer for help which Jonah uttered in the belly of the fish, according to v. ^{1} (Engl. v. ^{2}). Yahweh's *holy temple* is here also the temple at Jerusalem. This is an interesting verse for the belief in the necessity and efficacy of prayer. The author evidently believes that Yahweh would not have interposed, if Jonah had not prayed, *cf.* also 1^6. And his conviction of the readiness and ability of Yahweh to help those who pray to Him leads him to utter the following remark about idolators, which seems at first so out of keeping with the whole tenor of the psalm, that one might be inclined to regard it as an interpolation, as Böhme and Duhm do. —**9** (Engl. v. ^{8}). It is folly to ally oneself with idols, for they are vain and cannot help, and by doing so one forsakes the only true source of help, Yahweh, who will not help then. For He hears only those who pray to Him. If original, the writer used the phrase *they forsake their loving-kindness* in the same way in which Ps. 144^2 speaks of Yahweh as *My loving-kindness*, *i. e.*, they forsake their only true love, their grace, their gracious God, who alone can save them. But it is probable that the original read, *they forsake their refuge* (Marti). *Cf.* Ps. 31^7 for the phrase *they who pay regard to vain idols*. This strophe is shorter than the others and is regarded as incomplete by Reuss and Briggs, and is filled out by Marti. It is a question whether our poet wrote strophes of four half-lines throughout or (with Dr. Briggs) strophes of six lines each concluding with a refrain. Nothing is missing in the thought, either between v. ^{8} and v. ^{9} or between v. ^{9} and v. ^{10}.—**10** (Engl. v. ^{9}). In contrast to these idolators our singer to whom Yahweh is his Love or Refuge declares fervently, that he will cling to Yahweh. With loud songs of thanksgiving will he sacrifice to Him. He means evidently material sacrifices (*cf.* Heb. word *slaughter* =

sacrifice), for he mentions also his willingness to pay the vows which he had made in the hour of his desperate need and which, according to ancient belief, were efficacious in eliciting God's aid, *cf.* 1^{16}. There were many different kind of vows, vows of a material and of a spiritual nature. Which were prominent in this psalmist's case we do not know. One might ask whether the inserter of the psalm interpreted this as referring to a vow of strict and unqualified obedience which Jonah made in the fish. But we cannot tell, since he says nothing about it. The whole psalm culminates in the shout of joy and gratitude that *help belongs to Yahweh* and to no one else, *cf.* Ps. 3^{9} (Engl. 3^{8}). He alone can give it, as the psalmist himself had experienced to his great joy. *Cf.* v. ^{10} with Ps. 42^{5} $50^{14.\,23}$.

3. 𝔊 𝔏 add *τὸν θεόν μου* after יהוה, this is probably due to v. ^{2}.—שִׁוַּעְתִּי 𝔊 *κραυγῆς μου* = שַׁוְעָתִי, 𝔐 is correct. Du. omits קוֹלִי in his transl. מצרה לי *cf.* Ps. 18^{7} 120^{1}. Du. omits לִי.—4. Evidently something new begins here, but the gram. constr. of ותשליכני connects it with the preceding. We should expect pf. without waw consec. So We., followed by Now., thinks that something has dropped out. Since the metre demands the omission of one word in v. ^{4a}, Schmidt om. ותשליכני, but this cannot be missed, Marti, Now.^{K}, Kau., Hpt. omit מצולה which should, if orig., be במצולה, while Siev., Now.^{2}, Gunk. omit בלבב ימים as an explanatory gloss. The second is the most probable. Du. retains both synonyms but regards v. ^{4b} as a quotation and gloss. For the phrase בלבב ימים *cf.* Ez. $27^{4.\,25}$. Hpt., Du. read נהרים (pl.) with 𝔊 𝔏, and this is most probably right, *cf.* Ps. 24^{2}; the vb. יסבבני must then, of course, also be pointed as pl.—5. נגרשתי, in the parall. Ps. 31^{23} נגרזתי, *I am cut off*. Gr., Böhme read this here also. But others change Ps. 31^{23} to נגרשתי, *e. g.*, Du., Briggs. For אַךְ read with Θ אַךְ = אֵיךְ, Stei., We., Now., Marti. Note the mistake in 𝔊^{B} *λαον* for *ναον*.

6. Hpt. om. v. ^{6a} as a gloss and transposes v. ^{6b} after v. ^{7a}. עַד נפשׁ 𝔗 עד מותא. 𝔊 𝔖 𝔏 read סוף for סוּף. 𝔗 and Aq. thought of the Red Sea: 𝔗 ימא דסוף, Aq. *ἐρύθρα*. Du.'s correction סְבָבַתְנִי, pf. for impf., is unnecessary, *cf.* Ges. $^{§\,107.\,1}$ and also the same use of יסבבני in v. ^{4}.

7. לקבצי הרים *to the extremities of the mountains*. 𝔗 לְעִקָּרֵי טוּרַיָּא. Gr., Böhme, Now., Marti (?) read לְקַצְוֵי, since קצב is not elsewhere used in the sense of extremity in the OT. But the occurrence of the phrase קצבי הרים in Ecclus. 16^{19}, where it is parall. to ויסודי תבל, proves its correctness here also, *cf.* BDB. It obviates Now.^{K}'s suggestion to read הארץ for הרים, or that of Ehr., Hpt. הים or that of Du. לקצת נהרים.—

Van H.'s conjecture of הרים *Hades* is highly improbable. הארץ בריחיה בעדי לעולם does not seem quite in order. The ancient and modern Vrss., except 𝔊 𝔏, supply a vb., *the earth with its bars* CLOSED *upon me forever*. But even then the difficulty is not altogether removed, because the statement is not true to the facts. The bars had not closed upon the psalmist *forever*. Of course, we might explain that this is hyperbolic and that he only thought so. But this does not seem right. Van H. seems to me to have suggested the right solution at this point by following 𝔊 *εἰς γῆν ἧς οἱ μοχλοὶ αὐτῆς κάτοχοι αἰώνιοι*, 𝔏 *cuius vectes sunt continentes æternæ*. He reads בַּדֵּי for בעדי and translates, *the land whose (gate) bars are everlasting bolts*. For the cstr. st. before a prep. *cf.* Ges. § 130a. This fits in with the context, for הארץ is the nether world, *cf.* Ex. 15[12], Ecclus. 51[9], Bab. *irṣitum*, and is preferable to Marti's ingenious reconstruction יָרַדְתִּי לְאֶרֶץ תַּחְתִּיּוֹת אֶל־עַם עוֹלָם, *I had gone down into the lowest part of the earth, to the dead people of antiquity*, and also to the emendations of Now., Siev., Hpt., Du. or Ries. Hpt. omits v. 7b. The metr. division differs from 𝔐, לקצבי הרים goes with the preceding str., ירדתי with the foll. הארץ. 𝔗 𝔊 𝔖 𝔍 connect שחת, *pit*, with שחת, *destruction, corruption*.

8. Some mss. read רוחי for נפשי. 𝔊 𝔏 𝔍 point ותבוא with waw conj. —**9.** Instead of the prtc. Pi. משמרים which is found only here many read with the parall. Ps. 31[7] השמרים. In Dt. 32[21] חבלי שוא is parall. to לא־אל. The use of חסדם in this verse is unusual and paralleled only by Ps. 144[2]. It is variously translated by *their mercy*, *their fortune* (Hi., Gunk.), *their best* (We.), *their providence* (van H.), *their piety* (Du.). If orig., it is best to interpret it, as in Ps. 144[2], as meaning the author of their true good, *they forsake their own true grace*. But it seems preferable to emend the text slightly with Marti, Now.[K] מַחְסָם, *their refuge*. 𝔗 already felt a difficulty here and so paraphrased מְאַחַר דְּאִתּוּטַב לְהוֹן לֵית אִנּוּן יָדְעִין, similarly Ehr., *wenn jemand zu nichtigen Götzen sich versieht, halten diese mit ihrer Gnade zurück*. But the constr. does not favour this. 𝔖 evades the difficulty by reading הסרך.—**10** (Engl. v. 9). Now.[K] suggests בְּקָהָל for בְּקוֹל. Gr., Che. read אזכרה for אזבחה. But this meaning can be gotten without emendation, *cf.* We.'s translation, *but I will sacrifice to Thee songs of praise*. For תודה 𝔊 𝔏 have a double transl. which does not presuppose a different orig. On the poetic ending in יְשׁוּעָתָה see Ges. § 90g and *cf.* Ps. 3[3] 80[3]. There is difference of opinion in regard to the last line. 𝔐 does not connect אשלם with ליהוה, the Vrss. as a rule do. But 𝔐 is in line with v. 8 f. and preferable, *cf.* also Ps. 3[9]. Yahweh alone is the true helper in time of need, for He alone has the power to help. The psalmist has experienced this and ends therefore his prayer with this jubilant expression of assured conviction.

YAHWEH'S RENEWED COMMAND AND JONAH'S PREACHING IN NINEVEH (3^{1-4}).

Jonah promptly obeyed the renewed command, went to Nineveh and delivered Yahweh's message that Nineveh would be destroyed in three days.

1. *Cf.* 1^1. There is no reproach of the prophet's former disobedience but simply the quiet reiteration of the command which brings out most beautifully Yahweh's gracious kindness. It had sometimes been thought that Jonah went first to Jerusalem after his deliverance to perform his vows in the temple, but our author says nothing about this and we cannot assume that "it goes without saying" (Halévy); on the contrary, the impression his story makes is that the command came to Jonah immediately after his deliverance and that it was promptly obeyed.—**2.** The content of the command is the same as before, *cf.* 1^2. But again it is not specified, *proclaim unto her the message which I am about to speak to thee.* That it would be the same message as before goes without saying. And that Jonah knew what it was is clear from v. ^{3}.—**3.** This time Jonah obeys without delay. His refractory spirit had been subdued by his terrible experience. The author says nothing about Jonah's thoughts and feelings with which he set out to do his duty. And we need not speculate on them either. He knew that the duty could not be evaded. *Now Nineveh*, the writer explains, *was an enormously large city*, lit. *a city great (even) for God,* who has a different measure of greatness. It required a three days' journey to travel through it. At first it seems as if the circumference of the city were meant, so that it would take three days to travel around it. This would agree with the statement of Diodorus (2^3) based on Ktesias that Nineveh's circumference was 480 stadia, which would be equivalent to a three days' journey, for Herodotus (5^{53}) estimates 150 stadia for a day's march and the present-day estimate of about 20 to 25 miles for it agrees with this. But that our author meant the diameter of the city is clear from v. ^{4} which implies that one day's march was only the beginning of Jonah's journey. When he wrote the city belonged to the dis-

tant past, as the Heb. verb shows, and it appeared much larger to him than it actually had been. Such exaggerations are characteristic of stories like this.

Diodorus (2[3]) writes about Nineveh "it was well-walled, of unequal lengths. Each of the longer sides was 150 stadia; each of the shorter 90. The whole circuit then being 480 stadia the hope of the founder was not disappointed. For no one afterward built a city of such compass, and with walls so magnificent."

F. Jones who surveyed the ruins of Nineveh gives the following measurements: "In more general language the enceinte of Nineveh may be said to form an irregular triangle, having its apex abruptly cut off to the south. The sides of this figure have a length respectively in the order described as follows:

	FT.
The East Wall	16,000
The North Wall	7,000
The West Wall, including space occupied by the great mounds of Koiyunjik and Nebbî Yúnus	13,600
The South Wall	3,000
Making a total circuit of	39,600

or 13,200 yards, equal to seven miles four furlongs of English statute measure; just *one-eighth* of the dimensions assigned to the city by Diodorus Siculus."—*Topography of Nineveh*, JRAS., XV (1855), p. 324.

These measurements of Jones tally with the authentic records of Sennacherib, who fortified Nineveh and made it his capital. In an inscription, recently acquired by the British Museum, No. 103,000, and published by L. W. King in *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets, . . . in the British Museum*, Part XXVI, 1909, Sennacherib describes Nineveh's improvements made by him, its system of fortification and its fifteen gates whose names are given; and in the course of the description he supplies valuable information concerning the measurements of the walls. Col. VII: [58]Nineveh, the area of whose circuit in former days [59]had been nine thousand three hundred cubits, [60]and for which the princes who went before me had not built [61]an inner and an outer wall,—[62]twelve thousand five hundred and fifteen cubits, from the unoccupied land of the city's enclosure, [63]I added to the former measurement, [64]and twenty-one thousand eight hundred and fifteen great suklum I made its extent (?)* Col. VIII: [13]I enlarged the area of Nineveh, my lordly city, [14]its open spaces I broadened, and I made it bright like the day, [15]I constructed an outer wall and made it high like a mountain."

Nothing could more effectively demolish the various theories which

* "The word clearly refers to the circumference of the walls."

attempt to prove the author's exactness in his estimate of Nineveh's size. The most interesting one of them suggests that the author meant Greater Nineveh, *i. e.*, the whole complex of cities between the Tigris and the Zab including Kalaḥ and Khorsabad (Schrader, *KAT.*[2], pp. 99*f.*). But that this complex of cities was ever one large whole is contradicted by the inscriptions and the survey of the ruins (*cf.* also Wkl., *KAT.*[3], p. 75, n. 4, Johns, *EB.*, III, col. 3420). The glossator of Gn. 10^{12}, however, explained *the great city* as consisting of the tetrapolis, Nineveh, Rehoboth-Ir, Kalaḥ and Resen. And Ktesias and Diodorus seem to have had some similar notion, for the entire circuit of the four seats of the Nineveh district is 61½ miles (Jones, *l. c.*, p. 303). If our author shared this view of the greater Nineveh, it would merely show that he lived long after the fall of Nineveh, at a time when its greatness was greatly exaggerated. It does not prove his historical accuracy. The text indeed shows that he exaggerated even more than Ktesias.

4. *And Jonah began his journey into the city* and after he had made *a day's journey* he began to preach. The narrator places him in the heart of the city before he begins his proclamation. The explanation that Jonah began to preach at once and that he preached all the way that first day is not in accordance with the words of the text. The Heb. would have expressed this differently. The substance of the message was, *Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown!* The same word is used of the overthrow of Sodom, *cf.* Gn. $19^{21.25}$ Dt. 29^{23} Am. 4^{11} Je. 20^{16} La. 4^{6}, it expresses the completeness of the destruction not its manner. No reason for the destruction is given, though it is suggested in 1^{2}, nor are any particulars furnished about the agents of the destruction. Nothing but the bare statement of the coming disaster, without any call to repentance! And yet the author knew that his hearers would understand that Yahweh was giving this warning to the Ninevites in the hope that they might repent and thus avert the certain doom. For this was always implied and understood, by Jonah himself also, as ch. 4^{2} shows. 𝔊 has only *three days* instead of forty, and this is in all likelihood the original reading, for the story moves rapidly and three days are much more in accord with it. After Jonah had traversed the city from west to east he could expect the judgment. So he sat down and waited, but not forty days! See further on 4^{5}. What language Jonah spoke, the narrator does not say. How the people could understand him,

unless he spoke Assyrian, has sometimes troubled the commentators. It has been suggested that the author probably meant that Jonah spoke Aramaic, which was the diplomatic language in the Persian period. But is it likely that the people of Nineveh understood Aramaic? To our author the language made as little difficulty as the similar question in what language Yahweh spoke to Adam made to the Yahwist. It simply did not occur to him. This is another sign of the folk-tale character of the story.

2. קריאה *sermon, message, prophecy*, only here in the OT. 𝔊 *κατὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τὸ ἔμπροσθεν ὃ ἐγὼ ἐλάλησα*, 𝔏 *secundum prædicationem priorem quam ego palam locutus sum ad te, i.e.*, כקריאה הראשונה אשר אנכי רברתי. Bu. is alone in thinking that this is "probably correct" "since only absolute obedience to the first command would agree with the context." But 𝔐 does not imply that the command would be different from the first. רֹּבֵר prtc. of imminent fut. Siev. om. אליה mtr. cs., and reads אני for אנכי.—**3.** On Nineveh *cf.* also Hpt., *JBL.*, XXVI (1907), pp. 4 *ff.* גרולה לאלהים, *great* (*even*) *for God, i. e.*, extraordinarily great. Kau., *unmenschlich gross*, *cf.* Gn. 10^9 where לפני is used for ל, with the same meaning. The pf. היתה shows that Nineveh is a thing of the past to the narrator. Siev. inserts וַיָּבוא after וילך mtr. cs. Hpt., *l. c.*, p. 16, regards מהלך שלשת ימים as a gloss (without giving his reason for it). Ries. regards v. ^{3b} as a gloss. He thinks that the glossator deduced the greatness of the city from the three days of grace and from the fact that Jonah made one day's journey on the first day.—**4.** ארבעים, 𝔊 *τρεῖς*, 𝔏 *triduum*. The latter is rightly accepted by Kohler, Du., Ries. (*v. s.*). 𝔐 changed *three* to *forty*, because forty would go better with the period of fasting (*cf.* Kohler, Ries.). נהפכת prtc. of imminent fut. Siev. om. בעיר mtr. cs.

THE RESULT OF JONAH'S PREACHING (3^{5-10}).

The Ninevites repent, Yahweh relents and spares Nineveh.

5. The Ninevites believed that God would carry out His threat. So they all repented immediately, proclaimed a fast and clothed themselves in sackcloth, all of them without exception, earnestly hoping that God would see their self-abasement and penitence, take pity on them, pardon their sins and avert the disaster. *Cf.* Jo. $1^{13\text{ f.}}$ $2^{12\text{ ff.}}$. Fasting and putting on of sackcloth are the outward signs of the sincere and whole-hearted penitence of the Ninevites, *cf.* v. ^{10}. It is interesting to note that the author uses the

term *God* here and not *Yahweh*. It was the divine message that they believed. Yahweh they did not know. So the author uses "God" and not the proper name Yahweh also in the following verses. The quick effect of Jonah's preaching is most wonderful, even if we take into account the emotional nature of the orientals. It stands in striking contrast to the unbelief and indifference with which Israel treated the prophetic announcements. And it is this point that is of most value to our author who wants to throw the repentance of Nineveh into sharp relief. So he works it out in some detail, evidently desirous of bringing out the universal character as well as the sincerity of Nineveh's repentance.—**6.** The report of the strange prophet and of his awe-inspiring message comes even into the royal palace before the king himself, who in true folk-lore fashion is pictured as sitting on his throne, clad in his splendid robes. The author gives no name, he calls him simply *the King of Nineveh*, as is customary in such stories, for it adds nothing to the tale. The king also believes at once, *he rose from his throne and put off his (royal) mantle and covered himself with sackcloth and sat in ashes*, a sign of humiliation and grief, *cf.* Jb. 2^{8}. Even the king himself! Mark the profound impression!—**7, 8.** Not satisfied with setting a personal example, the king sends out an edict and has it proclaimed all over Nineveh. *Cf.* Dn. 3^{4}, where the herald is mentioned who proclaims the decree. Official edicts appear too frequently after the people have already done or begun to do what is ordered in them, to permit us to overemphasise this point and regard these verses as secondary on that account. The introduction of the edict, *By decree of the king and of his nobles*, is either a mere official formula or (though the author in his characteristic brevity says nothing about it) it presupposes a hasty conference of the royal council. The decree commands that everybody in Nineveh, including the domestic animals, shall observe a strict fast, put on sackcloth, earnestly pray to God with all might and abandon his sins. The edict impresses some commentators as somewhat humorous. To the narrator it was intensely serious, *cf.* Judith 4^{9-15}. Even if he were humorous in other places, here he would defeat his own end by a humorous touch. The humour is due to a copyist. The domestic animals are to join in the gen-

eral abasement and so are to be deprived of food and drink. Though the parallel in Judith 4^{10} shows that the custom which Herodotus (9^{24}) reports of the Persians when the animals participated in the ceremonies of mourning for Masistius, was also Jewish, it is apparent that a copyist repeated somewhat carelessly *and animals* from v. ^{7} after *men* in v. ^{8}, so that the text now says that the animals were not only to be clothed in sackcloth but should also cry to Yahweh and repent of their evil ways. This was evidently not intended by the original author. The outward signs of penitence are to be matched by true repentance and reformation. The prayer is not to be perfunctory but intense, the conversion sincere, the abandonment of sin genuine. A high spiritual and moral conception underlies this edict. *Cf.* Is. 58^{5-7}. The sins of the Ninevites are moral and social; of idolatry the author does not speak. *Their evil way* is general. *The violence that is in their hands* refers to the social oppression practised by them, *cf.* Am. 3^{10}, rather than to Nineveh's cruelty to other nations.—**9.** The hope, not the certainty, that God may perhaps pardon them is expressed in the humble words, *who knows, God may once more have pity* (or *may turn and repent*) *and turn away from His hot anger, that we do not perish. Cf.* Jo. 2^{14}. With v. ^{9b} *cf.* Ex. 32^{12b}. It is recognised that their penitence does not put God under any obligation to spare them.—**10.** Their hope was not disappointed. *And God saw what they were doing*, lit. *their deeds*. With Him deeds count, not words. *That they had turned from their evil way* and had therefore genuinely repented. The narrator emphasises this. *So God relented of the evil which He said He would do to them and decided not to do it* (lit. *did it not*). *Cf.* Am. $7^{3.6}$ Ex. 32^{14}. The divine mercy was quickly aroused and the pardon of such sincerely penitent sinners speedily determined upon. The verse does not create the impression that Yahweh waited until the time of grace was ended to make up His mind not to punish them, but rather that He decided to spare them as soon as He saw their whole-hearted penitence.

5. Siev. regards באלהים as a theological gloss. האמין ב *believe in*, in the sense of believing that the word spoken was true, not in the sense of believing henceforth in Yahweh as the only God. 𝔗 correctly בְּמֵימְרָא

רָיָי. For מגדולם ועד קטנם *cf.* Ges. § 133 g. Hpt., *JBL.*, XXVI (1907), p. 16, following a suggestion made but not adopted by GASm., proposes to insert 3⁶ after 3³, but ויקראו צום in v. ⁵ after the royal edict is opposed to this.—**6.** Siev. inserts המלך after ויקם mtr. cs. 𝔖 thinks of the royal crown instead of the robe. Kleinert thinks that vv. ⁶ ff. are only a fuller recital of the brief statement of v. ⁵ and renders therefore the vbs. in vv. ⁶ ff. by plupfs.—**7.** וַיַּזְעֵק ויאמר 𝔊 𝔏 𝔖 take it as indirect constr. טעם an Aramaism, only here in the Heb. OT. in sense of *decision*, *decree*, but often in the Aram. sections of Ezra and Daniel. *Cf.* Assy.-Bab. *ṭêmu*, *command*. Siev. would omit either ויאמר and לאמר or הבקר והצאן. מטעם to לאמר belongs to the edict, whose intro. formula it is. Du. regards בנינוה also as part of the edict, *Gegeben zu Ninive*. Gr. puts אל ירעו after מאומה. But this is not necessary. It is true, טעם is used only with human beings, never with animals; רעה is used with animals. For that reason אל ירעו is added. A certain awkwardness both in v. ⁷ and v. ⁸ must be recognised, but this may be removed by omitting ובהמה in v. ⁸. Böhme omits אל ירעו. Ries. omits אל ירעו ומים אל ישתו. 𝔊 reads טעם (παρὰ) for מטעם.—**8.** האדם והבהמה is omitted by Böhme, We., Kau., Now., van H. But the difficulty is not solved thus, for these words would hold over as subject from the preceding. Omit only והבהמה. Siev. omits v. ⁸ᵇ as an addition intended to heighten the religious impression. His main reason however is metr. 𝔊 𝔏 wrongly read the impfs. with waw consec.—**9.** Bu. omits with 𝔊 𝔏 ו ישוב.—**10.** Siev. omits כי שבו מדרכם הרעה, *cf.* v. ⁸ᵇ, mtr. cs., and because he thinks their penitence is purely external. 𝔗's transl. is due to dogmatic scruples. —From v. ³ on אלהים is used for יהוה, again in 4⁷· ⁸· ⁹. 𝔖 has a free transl. for אשר דבר', corresponding to v. ².

JONAH'S DISPLEASURE (4^{1-5}).

Jonah, much vexed at the sparing of Nineveh, remonstrates with Yahweh. Had he not anticipated just this, when he was still at home? And had he not fled when the divine summons came to him the first time, simply in order to prevent just this? Did he not know that Nineveh was to be spared after all? Ah, if he were only dead! Quietly Yahweh asks him whether he thinks that his anger is justified, but he makes no reply. He leaves the city and sits down in sullen silence to the east of it.

1. Jonah recognises that Yahweh has forgiven Nineveh and that He will not destroy it. He needed no special divine revelation for this, for it was in accord with Yahweh's character and prophetic

doctrine. Nor did he need to wait till the time of grace was over to know Yahweh's change of attitude. He knew it as soon as he saw the repentance of the people. But instead of rejoicing over Yahweh's kindness, he was displeased exceedingly and very angry. —**2.** That was exactly what he had feared when he was still at home. It was for this reason, he tells Yahweh, in an indignant prayer, that he had fled when the divine command came to him the first time. He knew Yahweh's wonderful grace, His patience and readiness to relent, too well, not to foresee that He would forgive the Ninevites if they repented. And he had no desire to be the messenger who was to warn them of the doom to come and thus be the means of saving them. He hoped and wished that Nineveh go down to its doom unwarned. His remonstrance is put by the author in the form of a prayer in order to mitigate its bitterness.—"It is noteworthy," says Wellhausen, "that the unfulfilled prophecy does not awaken in Jonah any doubt whatever, whether he was really sent by God." But this is not surprising, for he knew that in uttering the prediction he was warning the Ninevites, and he says himself that he knew it would not be fulfilled, if they repented. For Yahweh was *a God gracious and compassionate, full of patience and of great kindness, and relenting of the evil* which He had threatened,—if men would but turn from their sins in true penitence. That this condition is implied is plain from the entire prophetic teaching of the OT. Jonah was not angry because his own personal prestige would be lost by the non-occurrence of the doom which he had announced, but because Nineveh had been spared and because he himself had brought this about by his warning. That is the tantalising part of it, which drives him to despair.—**3.** And so he wishes he were dead and prays Yahweh to take his life from him. Of what use is life for him now, it were far better if he were dead. One is reminded of the similar scene in 1 K. 19^4 where Elijah, thwarted in his desire, also begs to die. The reason is not offended prophetic vanity in Elijah either. —**4.** Jonah's anger is most unreasonable, but of course he does not see it. The author wants to lay stress on this, so Yahweh says to the prophet, *Dost thou think thou art justified in being so angry?* This involves a reproof. But Yahweh is dealing gently with him.

He is in no haste to insist on swift repentance, but wants to develop in Jonah the thought of the impropriety of his anger. Strangely enough no answer to Yahweh's question is recorded. If it has not been omitted accidentally, we must understand that Jonah did not answer. Did he return a sullen silence to Yahweh's question? But v. [4] is perhaps not original here (Bu., Marti) or we must perhaps supply the answer from v. [9], *I am rightly angry unto death* (Du.).—**5.** The recognition that Nineveh would be spared had come to Jonah while in the city, as he witnessed the effect of his preaching in the sincere repentance of the people. He had traversed it from west to east. Three days it had taken. And now he leaves it and sits down on the east of it in angry disappointment and dismay. It is a situation true to life. Jonah had gone all through the city, he had finished his commission, he knows its result and now he sits down to rest in his dejected mood. An ancient reader wondered why he should *stay* there, and so put in the explanatory statement *until he might see what would happen to the city*. But Jonah knew this already, and the author of the story could hardly put this in, for he gives no hint that Jonah had any hope whatever that Yahweh would destroy the city after all, and thus there would be no reason for him to make such a statement. We saw in connection with 3[4] that the original text read, *in yet three days Nineveh will be destroyed!* The three days had been changed to forty. The glossator read forty in his text and he concluded that if Jonah had to stay so long he would need a hut as a protection from the hot sun. So he inserted, *and he made himself a hut and sat down under it in the shade*. This was a natural reflection and yet unwittingly he spoiled by it the point of the following, for if Jonah could sit in the shade of the hut, the shade of the plant was not so necessary as v. [8] assumes. According to v. [8] Jonah had no other shelter from the rays of the sun than the plant. This difficulty cannot be evaded by pointing to the refreshing shade of the green leaves of the tree and to the unsatisfactory shelter of the hut. If the true character of v. [5b] as an explanatory gloss is recognised, the difficulties connected with this verse disappear. According to the original story Jonah needed neither to wait until he would see what would happen to the city, for he knew it already,

nor to make a hut, for the time allowed was not long enough. The author lets Jonah stay there not because Jonah was uncertain about the result of the repentance of Nineveh but in order to teach him the great lesson he so much needed to learn.

1. וירע אל־יונה רעה גדולה adverbial acc., see Ges.$^{\S 117q}$, same constr. with וירע in Ne. 2^{10}.—**2.** Siev. omits ויתפלל אל יהוה as a gloss intended to soften the effect of Jonah's ill-temper. אנה *cf.* 1^{14}. הלא־זה דברי idiomatic for our *did I not say so?* or *did I not know it?* בעוד = עד היותי היותי. על ארמתי *upon my own ground, in my own country, at home.*—For קרמתי לברח two translations are possible, (1) *I sought to prevent,* or *forestall* (*it*) *by fleeing;* (2) *I fled before.* The second takes קרמתי adverbially, just as, *e. g.*, שוב, יסף are used, Ges.$^{\S 114m.\,120a}$. The first seems to me preferable. Siev. omits here as in 1^3 תרשישה, also the whole of v. ^{2b} as an insertion = Jo. 2^{13} Ex. 34^6. His main reason is metr.—**3.** Siev. omits יהוה mtr. cs. 𝔊 𝔙 insert ארני before יהוה. 𝔊 𝔙 omit אֵל.—**4.** 𝔊 inserts *πρὸς* Ἰωνᾶν, 𝔙 *ad Ionam.* For הֲהֵיטֵב חָרָה לָךְ two translations are possible, (1) *dost thou well to be angry, dost thou think thou art justly angry,* or (2) *art thou very angry?* The first is to be preferred as suiting the context better. In v. ^{9} indeed the answer which Jonah gives to the question *yes, unto death* might seem to indicate that the author had the degree of anger in mind. But even in v. ^{9} the transl., *yes, I am rightly angry unto death,* is better fitting in view of the foll. speech of Yahweh.—**5.** The difficulties of v. ^{5} cannot be evaded by translating the vbs. as plupfs., for that would have been expressed by a circumstantial clause, as in 1^5. Wkl.'s ingenious transposition of 4^5 after 3^4 is accepted by Marti, Hpt., and for 4^{5a} by Kau., but it is not easily accounted for. Kohler, Kau., *et al.*, omit the reference to the hut. In spite of Now.'s protest it continues to be said, on We.'s authority, that 𝔊 omits בצל or that it is not well supported by 𝔊, when $𝔊^{BANQ}$ have it. We. does not omit it, others do. Marti thinks, if orig., it would have to be בצלה, but this is not necessary because of the immediately preceding תחתיה.

YAHWEH'S REBUKE OF JONAH (4^{6-9}).

Yahweh undertakes to cure Jonah of his refractoriness by an object lesson and so causes a ricinus tree to spring up very rapidly in order to provide shade for Jonah, who is much delighted over it. But his joy was doomed to be brief. For Yahweh orders a worm to attack and kill the tree on the next morning. At dawn the tree had already withered away. When now by God's special ordering a

sirocco springs up at sunrise and later the sun beats down on Jonah's head, which is no longer protected by the shade of the tree, he is so full of physical and mental misery that he wishes again to die, and passionately asserts in response to Yahweh's question that he is quite justified in being so exceedingly angry over the death of the tree.

6. Jonah is to be shown the unreasonableness of his own attitude and the justice of Yahweh's by an object lesson. Yahweh orders a plant with large leaves to grow up rapidly and high enough *above Jonah to be a shade over his head in order to deliver him from his vexation.* The plant, called in Heb. *ḳîḳāyôn*, was most probably the *ricinus* or *castor-oil tree* (AVm. palm-christ, RVm. Palma Christi) which has large leaves supplying welcome shade, and whose growth is rapid. Of course, its growth is here miraculously accelerated, for it springs up and grows during a single night (*cf.* v. [10]) to such height that it shades Jonah's head all through the next day. *Jonah rejoiced exceedingly over the ricinus tree*, esp. over its shade, but also over the tree itself which grew so rapidly. Vv. [10. 11] indicate that he showed not merely selfish joy but real interest in it. And thus by turning his attention away from the city to this miraculous plant Yahweh freed Jonah from his bad humour and filled his heart with delight. The author pictures here, psychologically correctly, how such a little thing can reconcile Jonah and then also how quickly he despairs again when the shade of the plant is taken away. One is again reminded of the scene of Elijah under the juniper tree, in spite of the difference of the two stories.—**7.** Jonah's joy was but brief. On the following morning, quite early, when dawn began to break, Yahweh ordered a worm to attack and kill the tree. Soon it had withered away. It has often been noted that the ricinus tree withers very quickly. —**8.** When now the sun rose, Yahweh ordered a *scorching east wind*, the much-dreaded sirocco with its oppressive and exhausting heat and dust. The east wind is introduced not for the purpose of drying up the plant (Bu.), or of tearing down the hut (Wkl.), but of intensifying the physical and mental distress of the prophet. It aggravates the discomfort of a hot summer-day manifold as every one who has experienced it can testify. And so it did with Jonah. When the hot sun beat fiercely on his head, he missed the protec-

tion of the shady ricinus leaves, and (we may supply from v. [9]) was sorry over its sudden decay. Exhausted and enervated by the terrible heat, he became fretful and irritable and again wished to die, *cf.* v. [3] and 1 K. 19[4].—**9.** *Cf.* v. [4]. Then Yahweh asks him whether he thinks that his anger is really justified. But this time the reason for his anger is different. In v. [1] he was angry because Nineveh was ***not*** destroyed, here he is very angry because the tree ***is*** destroyed. This inconsistency is vividly brought out when Yahweh asks him, ***Art thou justly angry on account of the ricinus tree?*** The destruction of a whole city with thousands of people he desired, and when it did ***not*** come about he was angry, but when the worthless plant is destroyed he is angry and sorry, and answers with great vehemence yes, ***even unto death***, expressing the great excess of his anger.

6. On the use יהוה אלהים see pp. 64 *f.* It is not due to Gn. 2[4 ff.] but represents a conflated text. Etymologically קִיקָיוֹן appears to be connected with the Egyptian *Kiki* = *ricinus* (Talmudic קיק), the *κρότων* of the Greeks (Herod., 2[94] Pliny, 15[7]). The Assy. *ḳûḳânîtu* has not been definitely identified. It was a kind of garden plant. The identification of *ḳîḳāyôn* with the *bottle gourd* by 𝔊 𝔖 𝔗 has no philological justification and seems to have been guessed by 𝔊 as being the most probable plant in connection with a hut. And this is true. "Speaking of Môṣul, Ḳazwînî describes the custom of making tents of reeds (on the shores of the Tigris), in which the inhabitants pass the summer nights, when the water is becoming low. As soon as the earth where the tents are, has become dry enough, they sow gourds, which quickly spring up and climb round the tents" (G. Jacob, *Altarabische Parallelen*, pp. 17 *f.*). But we saw that the hut is not an orig. part of the text. And the identification has thus no more foundation than that with ivy (Σ 𝔙). —להציל לו is an old error already in the Heb. text of 𝔊 (*τοῦ σκιάζειν αὐτῷ* = לְהָצֵל לו), due to dittog. for לְהַצִּילוֹ. Böhme, We., *et al.*, omit להציל לו מרעתו as a doublet of להיות צל על ראשו. Wkl. prefers to omit the latter because he believes the hut gave Jonah shade, and that he needed diversion. Now.[2] marks in his transl. both clauses as secondary, but Now.[K] only להציל. As an alternative Now.[K] suggests לְהָצֵל לו without מרעתו. But then the doublet character appears at once and one of the two clauses must be omitted. If we are right in omitting v. [5b] as secondary, both clauses are orig. and there is no need of deleting either. —**7.** Siev. reads יהוה אלהים, so also 𝔖, but *cf.* pp. 64 *f.* בעלות השחר 𝔊 freely *ἑωθινῇ* as in Am. 7[1].—**8.** Siev. reads here again יהוה אלהים mtr. cs. 𝔖 also. The exact meaning of חרישית is disputed. 𝔊 𝔗 𝔖 translate

it ***burning, scorching;*** 𝕿 שְׁתִיקָא *quiet = sultry, sweltering*. Hi. thought that it was derived from חרשׁ, *to plough*, and defined it as *an autumnal east wind*. SS. took it from חרשׁ, *to cut = a cutting east wind*. Kohler connected it with חֶרֶס, *sun*, and compared it with חֶרֶשׂ, *dried clay*, while We. does not attempt an explanation. Not satisfied with these translations and derivations, Stei. emends, reading חריסית, as if from חֶרֶס, *sun* (*cf.* Kohler) = *hot, glowing*. Gr. proposed חַרְחֻרֶת, *cf.* Dt. 28²²; Böhme, Hal. חרירית from חרר, *to glow*. Che. proposes בַּשַּׁחַר *in the morning*, but this had been expressed at the beginning of the verse. Perhaps I may venture to suggest מַחֲרֶבֶת, *scorching*, מ was omitted by haplog. and ב was mistaken for שׁ, which in the older form of writing was quite easy. 𝔊 may still have read מַחֲרֶבֶת. Vol. thinks 𝔊 read חֹרֶב or מחריב. וחך *cf.* Is. 49¹⁰ Ps. 121⁶. וישאל את־נפשו למות, lit. *and he begged his soul that it might die, i. e., wished for himself that he might die*. Marti thinks it was an old phrase originally meaning *to curse oneself*, *cf.* Jb. 31³⁰ לִשְׁאֹל בְּאָלָה נַפְשׁוֹ. 𝔊 transl. freely ἀπελέγετο τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Vol. compares for this Plutarch, *Moral.*, p. 1060 D: ἀπολ. τὸν βίον. 𝔖 inserts, *and it dried up the gourd*, at the end. Wkl. also feels that the purpose of the wind should be expressed and so suggests that there stood originally, *and it tore down the hut*. But nothing is said in the foll. about the collapse of the hut and Jonah's anger over it, only the ricinus is mentioned. It would also have weakened Yahweh's argument, for Jonah had laboured for the hut. Now.[K] suggests the transposition of v.⁸ before v.⁶, but not only is nothing gained by this but the situation is better in the traditional order. V.⁹ presupposes v.⁸ immediately before. 𝔖 introduces instead of טוב מותי מחיי the words of Elijah from 1 K. 19⁴, of which one is indeed involuntarily reminded in this connection, *Thou canst take my life from me, O Lord, for I am not better than my fathers*.

APPLICATION OF THE OBJECT LESSON ($4^{10.\ 11}$).

Yahweh draws the unanswerable lesson for Jonah. If Jonah has taken such a deep interest in a wild, ephemeral plant, which had cost him no labour or thought, and thinks himself justified in it, how much more is Yahweh justified in taking a deep and compassionate interest in the great city of Nineveh with its thousands of inhabitants and tens of thousands of innocent children and animals!

10. Jonah's violence forms a beautiful background to Yahweh's wonderful interpretation and application of the object lesson, by which He shows to Jonah the inconsistency of his position. The petty narrowness and blind prejudice of Jonah set off God's pa-

tience and mercy and love for all mankind most effectively. Yahweh compares Jonah's attitude toward the ricinus with His own attitude toward Nineveh. Thou wast full of pity on account of the ricinus because it perished so soon. And yet it was only a wild plant, it did not belong to thee. Thou couldst not possibly have for it the interest and the attachment of one who had planted and tended it, for thou hadst done nothing at all for it. Besides, it was but ephemeral, it grew up in a night and perished in a night (Heb. *son of a night*), it was therefore not of much value nor could thy attachment to it be so very deep because it lived such a short time. And yet thou didst pity it when it died!—**11.** *And I should not have pity on Nineveh, that great city?* Will Jonah deny this same natural affection to Yahweh? Nineveh is of far more importance and value than a wild ephemeral plant! Yahweh had laboured for it, for He, the only God, was the creator of all the inhabitants as well as of the animals, and He had made the city grow to such wonderful greatness. All this is implied in the contrast to v. [10]. In His righteousness Yahweh had intended to punish it for its wickedness, the complaint over which had come up to His heavenly throne, for He ever punishes sin where He finds it, in Israel or elsewhere, as His prophets had proclaimed long ago, *cf.* Am. 1, 2. And so He had sent a prophet to them to warn them of the wrath to come, and they had sincerely repented. And long ago He had said through Jeremiah ($18^{7f.}$), *At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up and to break down and to destroy it; if that nation, concerning which I have spoken, turn from their evil, I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them!* What can He do but forgive? There were besides the penitent sinners in that vast city 120,000 little innocent children who were not old enough to know how to distinguish between right and left, and who could therefore not be punished for their sins, and also a great number of morally irresponsible animals for which Yahweh in His mercy also cares (*cf.* Dt. 25^{4}). *Should I not have pity on Nineveh, that great city, in which there are more than* 120,000 *human beings who do not know the difference between right and left, and* (*so*) *much cattle?* The argument is absolutely irresistible. There was but one answer

possible. But the author wisely refrains from adding anything about Jonah. He wants to let the question sink deep into the minds of his hearers and readers. He wants to teach the narrow, blind, prejudiced, fanatic Jews of which Jonah is but the type that "the love of God is wider than the measures of man's mind, And the heart of the Eternal is most wonderfully kind: But we make His love too narrow by false limits of our own." It embraces all men, not only Israel, even Israel's enemies! For all men are God's creatures. He is the God of all and just as full of love and care for heathen as for the Jews and just as ready to pardon them, if they abandon their sins and resort to Him. Should we not share His love and His purposes?

10. שֶׁבִּן = אשר בן, *cf.* 1^7. The phrase בן־לילה *son of a night* is idiomatic, it had grown in one night and in another night it perished, *cf.* Ges. § 128v. Similarly son of a year = one year old. On the form בִּן *cf.* Ges. § 96. Following Böhme, Ries. omits 'שבן לילה'. He thinks it was inserted by a reader who misunderstood v. 6, which should be translated by plupf., Yahweh *had* ordered the ricinus. Jonah found it when he went out there and sat down in its shade. Ries. gets thus rid of the miracle. Similarly already Michaelis.—11. ואני לא אחוס is an interrogative sentence, *cf.* Ges. § 150a, indicated as such only by the tone.—משׂחים without reduplication *cf.* Ges. § 20m. Schmidt, Siev. suspect ובהמה רבה as secondary, but it is safeguarded by $3^{7f.}$. For יש־בה 𝔊 𝔗 read wrongly ישבו. From the number of little children, 120,000, a total population of about 600,000 has been estimated. That Nineveh proper could never have contained so many inhabitants is clear. F. Jones estimated that the population may have been about 174,000, allowing fifty square yards to each person. If only children under two years are meant, the total number of inhabitants would have been over a million.—On the genuineness of Je. $18^{7ff.}$ see Bewer, in *Essays in Modern Theology and Related Subjects . . . A Testimonial to Charles Augustus Briggs* (1911), pp. 31 *f.*

NOTE ON THE USE OF יהוה AND אלהים IN THE BOOK OF JONAH.

In chs. 1–3 the divine name used by the heathen is אלהים or האלהים, by the Hebrew it is יהוה. Only in 3^{10} we might perhaps have expected יהוה, but האלהים is in line with the preceding. The real difficulty is in ch. 4, for here יהוה and אלהים or האלהים are used promiscuously, without any reason for the variation. *E. g.*, the same question is introduced

in v.[4] by ויאמר יהוה, in v.[9] by ויאמר אלהים. Or the same action is introduced in v.[7] by וימן האלהים, in v.[8] by וימן אלהים, in v.[6] by וימן יהוה אלהים. —Now in v.[7] 𝔊[ℵ*] reads ων (= יהוה), 𝔏 *dominus;* 𝔊[AQ. 26. 36. 49. 62. 106. 147. 233] *κύριος ὁ θεός*, 𝔊[B] Luc., Hes. *ὁ θεός*. In v.[8] 𝔊[AQ. 36. 153] *κύριος*, 𝔙 *dominus*. In v.[9] 𝔊[BQ. 46. 86. 185] *ὁ θεός*, 𝔊[153. 233] *κύριος*, 𝔏 𝔙 *dominus*, 𝔊[Y] Luc. Hes. 𝔖[H] *κύριος ὁ θεός*. 𝔖 reads all through vv.[6-9] יהוה אלהים. These variants are significant. They show in regard to the reading יהוה אלהים in 4[6] that it is a conflation pure and simple. Note, *e. g.*, the similar process in 4[9] where some Gk. mss. have *κύριος*, others *ὁ θεός*, still others *κύριος ὁ θεός*. The process was the same in Heb. mss. In view of this, it is remarkable that the view that our author is dependent on Gn. 2 for the combination יהוה אלהים should still be entertained. Our author did not write that combination, he wrote simply יהוה. A copyist, or reader, under the influence of ch. 3 wrote אלהים probably all through ch. 4, but in some instances the orig. readings reasserted themselves. There can be no doubt that the author wrote יהוה all through ch. 4, for here there was no reason for אלהים, as in chs. 1, 3.

The International Critical Commentary

VOLUMES NOW READY

Genesis. By the Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England.

"Exact scholarship, a scientific temper of mind, and the reverence of a believer in Divine revelation combine to render Principal Skinner an ideal commentator on the Book of Genesis. The work before us will unquestionably take its place in the very front rank of modern Old Testament commentaries. We can award it no higher praise than to say that it need not shrink from comparison with what has hitherto been *facile princeps* in the series to which it belongs—Driver's Deuteronomy."—Rev. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., in *The Expository Times*.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net*.

Numbers. By the Rev. G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

"Most Bible readers have the impression that 'Numbers' is a dull book only relieved by the brilliancy of the Balaam chapters and some snatches of old Hebrew songs, but, as Prof. Gray shows with admirable skill and insight, its historical and religious value is not that which lies on the surface. Prof. Gray's commentary is distinguished by fine scholarship and sanity of judgment; it is impossible to commend it too warmly."—*Saturday Review* (London).

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net*.

Deuteronomy. By the Rev. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

"It is a pleasure to see at last a really critical Old Testament commentary in English upon a portion of the Pentateuch, and especially one of such merit. This I find superior to any other commentary in any language upon Deuteronomy."

—Professor E. L. CURTIS, of Yale University.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net*.

Judges. By Rev. GEORGE FOOT MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Theology in Harvard University.

"The work is done in an atmosphere of scholarly interest and indifference to dogmatism and controversy, which is at least refreshing. . . . It is a noble introduction to the moral forces, ideas and influences that controlled the period of the Judges, and a model of what a historical commentary, with a practical end in view, should be."

—*The Independent*.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net*.

VOLUMES NOW READY

The Books of Samuel. By Rev. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and History of Religion, Meadville, Pa.

"Professor Smith's commentary will for some time be the standard work on Samuel, and we heartily congratulate him on scholarly work so faithfully accomplished."—*The Athenæum.*

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

The Books of Chronicles. By the Rev. EDWARD L. CURTIS, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Yale University, and Rev. ALBERT A. MADSEN, Ph.D.

"The commentary deserves unstinted praise, and will be found of extreme value by all who are interested in this late constituent of the Canon, which possesses so much interest alike from the literary and the religious stand-point. Dr. Curtis has supplied the English-speaking student of the Old Testament with precisely the work he required."
—Rev. J. A. SELBIE, D.D., in *The Expository Times.*

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net* (Postage additional).

Esther. By L. B. PATON, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Hartford Theological Seminary.

This scholarly and critical commentary on the Book of Esther presents in full the remarkable additions to the Massoretic text and the variations in the various versions beginning with the Greek translation and continuing through the Vulgate and Peshitto down to the Talmud and Targums. These are not given in full in any other commentary, yet they are very important both for the history of the text and the history of the exegesis.

Crown 8vo. $2.25 *net.*

The Book of Psalms. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., Graduate Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York, and EMILIE GRACE BRIGGS, B.D.

"Christian scholarship seems here to have reached the highest level yet attained in study of the book which in religious importance stands next to the Gospels. His work upon it is not likely to be excelled in learning, both massive and minute, by any volume of the International Series, to which it belongs."—*The Outlook.*

2 Volumes. Crown 8vo. Price, $3.00 each *net.*

Proverbs. By the Rev. CRAWFORD H. TOY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew in Harvard University.

This volume has the same characteristics of thoroughness and painstaking scholarship as the preceding issues of the series. In the critical treatment of the text, in noting the various readings and the force of the words in the original Hebrew, it leaves nothing to be desired.

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

VOLUMES NOW READY

St. Matthew. By the Rev. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

"As a microscopic and practically exhaustive study and itemized statement of the probable or possible sources of the Synoptic Gospels and of their relations, one to another, this work has not been surpassed. I doubt if it has been equaled. And the author is not by any means lacking in spiritual insight."—*The Methodist Review* (Nashville).

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

St. Mark. By the Rev. E. P. GOULD, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia.

"The whole make-up is that of a thoroughly helpful, instructive critical study of the World, surpassing anything of the kind ever attempted in the English language, and to students and clergymen knowing the proper use of a commentary it will prove an invaluable aid."

—*The Lutheran Quarterly.*

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

St. Luke. By the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D., sometime Master of University College, Durham.

"We are pleased with the thoroughness and scientific accuracy of the interpretations. . . . It seems to us that the prevailing characteristic of the book is common sense, fortified by learning and piety."

—*The Herald and Presbyter.*

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

Romans. By the Rev. WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, and the Rev. A. C. HEADLAM, M.A., D.D., Principal of Kings College, London.

"We do not hesitate to commend this as the best commentary on Romans yet written in English. It will do much to popularize this admirable and much needed series, by showing that it is possible to be critical and scholarly and at the same time devout and spiritual, and intelligible to plain Bible readers."—*The Church Standard.*

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

First Corinthians. By the Rt. Rev. ARCHIBALD ROBERTSON, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of Exeter, and the Rev. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., late Master of University College, Durham.

"Besides the commentary, which constitutes the bulk of the volume, introductory dissertations are included on Corinth, on the authenticity of I Corinthians, on its occasion and plan, place and date, doctrinal content, characteristic style and language, texts and bibliography. The volume follows up the high standard set for it in its predecessors."

—*The Continent.*

Crown 8vo. $3.00 *net.*

The International Theological Library

EDITORS' PREFACE

THEOLOGY has made great and rapid advances in recent years. New lines of investigation have been opened up, fresh light has been cast upon many subjects of the deepest interest, and the historical method has been applied with important results. This has prepared the way for a Library of Theological Science, and has created the demand for it. It has also made it at once opportune and practicable now to secure the services of specialists in the different departments of Theology, and to associate them in an enterprise which will furnish a record of Theological inquiry up to date.

This Library is designed to cover the whole field of Christian Theology. Each volume is to be complete in itself, while, at the same time, it will form part of a carefully planned whole. One of the Editors is to prepare a volume of Theological Encyclopædia which will give the history and literature of each department, as well as of Theology as a whole.

The Library is intended to form a series of Text-Books for Students of Theology.

The Authors, therefore, aim at conciseness and compactness of statement. At the same time, they have in view that large and increasing class of students, in other departments of inquiry, who desire to have a systematic and thorough exposition of Theological Science. Technical matters will therefore be thrown into the form of notes, and the text will be made as readable and attractive as possible.

The Library is international and interconfessional. It will be conducted in a catholic spirit, and in the interests of Theology as a science.

Its aim will be to give full and impartial statements both of the results of Theological Science and of he questions which are still at issue in the different departments.

The Authors will be scholars of recognized reputation in the several branches of study assigned to them. They will be associated with each other and with the Editors in the effort to provide a series of volumes which may adequately represent the present condition of investigation, and indicate the way for further progress.

CHARLES A. BRIGGS
STEWART D. F. SALMOND

ARRANGEMENT OF VOLUMES AND AUTHORS

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. DRIVER, D.D., D.Litt., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. JOHN SKINNER, D.D., Principal and Professor of Old Testament Language and Literature, College of the Presbyterian Church of England, Cambridge, England, and the Rev. OWEN WHITEHOUSE, B.A., Principal and Professor of Hebrew, Chestnut College, Cambridge, England.

OLD TESTAMENT HISTORY. By HENRY PRESERVED SMITH, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature, Meadville, Pa. [*Now Ready.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By FRANCIS BROWN, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt., President and Professor of Hebrew, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

THEOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Hebrew, New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Rev. JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., Minister United Free Church, Broughty Ferry, Scotland. [*Now Ready.*

CANON AND TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY, D.D., LL.D., Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leipzig. [*Now Ready.*

THE LIFE OF CHRIST. By WILLIAM SANDAY, D.D., LL.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT, D.D., Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York. [*Now Ready.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By FRANK C. PORTER, D.D., Professor of Biblical Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Now Ready.*

BIBLICAL ARCHÆOLOGY. By G. BUCHANAN GRAY, D.D., Professor of Hebrew, Mansfield College, Oxford.

THE ANCIENT CATHOLIC CHURCH. By ROBERT RAINEY, D.D., LL.D., sometime Principal of New College, Edinburgh. [*Now Ready.*

THE LATIN CHURCH FROM GREGORY THE GREAT TO THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. [*Author to be announced later*

THE GREEK AND EASTERN CHURCHES. By W. F. ADENEY, D.D., Principal of Independent College, Manchester. [*Now Ready.*

THE REFORMATION. By T. M. LINDSAY, D.D., Principal of the United Free College, Glasgow. [*2 vols. Now Ready.*

CHRISTIANITY IN LATIN COUNTRIES SINCE THE COUNCIL OF TRENT. By PAUL SABATIER, D.Litt., Drome, France.

SYMBOLICS. By CHARLES A. BRIGGS, D.D., D.Litt., Professor of Theological Encyclopædia and Symbolics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By G. P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Yale University, New Haven, Conn. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

CHRISTIAN INSTITUTIONS. By A. V. G. ALLEN, D.D., sometime Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Protestant Episcopal Divinity School, Cambridge, Mass. [*Now Ready.*

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. By GEORGE GALLAWAY, D.D., Minister of United Free Church, Castle Douglas, Scotland.

THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS. By GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Harvard University.

APOLOGETICS. By A. B. BRUCE, D.D., sometime Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF GOD. By WILLIAM N. CLARKE, D. D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Hamilton Theological Seminary. [*Now Ready.*

THE DOCTRINE OF MAN. By WILLIAM P. PATERSON, D.D., Professor of Divinity, University of Edinburgh.

THE DOCTRINE OF CHRIST. By H. R. MACKINTOSH, Ph.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, New College, Edinburgh. [*In Press.*

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SALVATION. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., sometime Professor of Systematic Theology, Yale University. [*Now Ready.*

THE DOCTRINE OF THE CHRISTIAN LIFE. By WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN, D.D., Professor of Systematic Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. By NEWMAN SMYTH, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, New Haven. [*Revised and Enlarged Edition.*

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR AND THE WORKING CHURCH. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., Pastor of Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio. [*Now Ready.*

THE CHRISTIAN PREACHER. By A. E. GARVIE, D.D., Principal of New College, London, England.

☞ OTHER VOLUMES WILL BE ANNOUNCED LATER.

VOLUMES NOW READY

The Theology of the New Testament. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., LL.D.

"It is a fine example of painstaking, discriminating, impartial research and statement."—*The Congregationalist.* Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

History of Christian Doctrine. By GEORGE P. FISHER, D.D., LL.D.

"It is only just to say that Dr. Fisher has produced the best History of Doctrine that we have in English."—*The New York Evangelist.*

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

The Christian Pastor and the Working Church. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., LL.D.

"A comprehensive, inspiring and helpful guide to a busy pastor. One finds in it a multitude of practical suggestions for the development of the spiritual and working life of the Church, and the answer to many problems that are a constant perplexity to the faithful minister."

—*The Christian Intelligencer.*

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

Christian Institutions. By ALEXANDER V. B. ALLEN, D.D.

"Professor Allen's Christian Institutions may be regarded as the most important permanent contribution which the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has yet made to general theological thought."—*The American Journal of Theology.*

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

The Theology of the Old Testament. By A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt.

"We hope every clergyman will not rest content until he has procured and studied this most admirable and useful book. Every really useful question relating to man—his nature, his fall, and his redemption, his present life or grace, his life after death, his future life, is treated of."—*The Canadian Churchman.* Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

The Christian Doctrine of Salvation. By GEORGE B. STEVENS, D.D., LL.D.

"Professor Stevens has performed a task of great importance, certain to exert wide and helpful influence in settling the minds of men. He has treated the subject historically and has given to Christ the first place in interpreting his own mission."—*Congregationalist and Christian World.*

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net.*

VOLUMES NOW READY

The Christian Doctrine of God. By WILLIAM N. CLARKE, D.D.

"The book is a treasury of learning, and its fairness in dealing with the matter in hand is admirable. From first to last, the purpose of the author is not to show upon how slight basis our confidence in the canonicity of the New Testament is based, but rather upon how solid a foundation our confidence rests."—*Journal and Messenger*.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net*.

An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. By JAMES MOFFATT, B.D., D.D.

"In point of scholarship, breadth of treatment, and mastery of the problems at issue, it will bear comparison with Driver's companion volume on the literature of the Old Testament, than which no higher praise can be given. . . . The student will find in Dr. Moffatt's volume the most complete presentation as yet attempted by any scholar of all that modern critical scholarship has done for the literature of the New Testament."—*Scotsman*.

Crown 8vo. $2.50 *net*.